

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-NINTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 7, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we rejoice before Thee this morning that Thou dost continue Thy mercies, and grant unto us to-day such a realization of dependence upon Thee that we may fulfill Thy holy will. Lead us in thought and in purpose along paths of devotion and consecration to the very highest interests of our loved people, the land in which we live, amid all the circumstances of life and responsibility. Hear us; help us, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 14827) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

SEIZED GERMAN SHIPS (S. DOC. NO. 191)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 310 (submitted by Mr. King and agreed to January 6, 1927), copies of all communications called for in the resolution relative to settlements in connection with seized German ships, but stating that "The Treasury has no record of any communications with a Mr. Hunt, stated to be attorney for the German shipowners," which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE (S. DOC. NO. 192)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In a message which I submitted to you on January 4, 1926, I recommended the appropriation of the sum of \$50,000 to cover the expenses of American participation in the work of the "Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, being a commission to prepare for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments." By H. J. Resolution 107, approved February 1, 1926, you authorized the appropriation of this amount.

The Preparatory Commission met at Geneva on May 18, 1926. Its work has continued, through plenary sessions and subcommittee meetings, since that date. The task of the commission's subcommittees, to which was delegated the detailed study of many of the problems presented to it, has virtually been completed, and it is planned to hold another plenary meeting of the commission, probably in March, to consider the subcommittee reports. Although it is difficult to predict the exact duration of the forthcoming sessions, it can reasonably be assumed that they will continue over a period of some months. It is the avowed purpose of the Preparatory Commission at the forthcoming meetings to evolve a definite agenda for a conference for the reduction and limitation of armament, which is, of course, the end to which the deliberations of the Preparatory Commission are directed.

I believe that the preliminary work has been useful, and that there is good reason to hope for concrete results from

further meetings. Our representatives have consistently endeavored to play a helpful part, and to direct the attention of the commission to the possibility of practical accomplishment.

I believe that we should continue to give our full cooperation to the work of the Preparatory Commission with a view to bringing about, as quickly as possible, a final conference, at which further steps may be taken to reduce and limit armaments.

The policy of this Government to favor measures which hold out practical hopes for the limitation of armament is firmly established. By continuing our hearty cooperation in the preparatory work we shall be able to do our share in formulating an agenda for the final conference which will give promise of actual agreements for arms limitation.

The appropriation of \$50,000, already made for this work, has been exhausted. I therefore recommend that there be authorized further appropriation of \$75,000 to cover the expenses of American participation in the forthcoming activities of the Preparatory Commission. I recommend this sum because, when the commission undertakes the actual drafting of an agenda, it may be necessary to send a considerable number of American representatives to insure adequate representation in all phases of the work. Since the exact requirements can not be foreseen, and will depend on developments, it appears wise to provide a sufficient appropriation to meet contingencies that may arise.

In relation to the form of the appropriation, the prices prevailing at Geneva and the nature of the responsibility devolving upon the members of the delegation make it important that their expenditures for subsistence be exempted from the restrictions imposed by existing law and be made discretionary with the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 7, 1927.

SPEECH ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PROHIBITION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I was somewhat inaccurately reported in one of the morning papers as to what I said last night in an address before the annual dinner of the Committee of One Thousand for Law Enforcement. In order that there may be no question as to what I did say and that the entire context of the speech may be available, I ask that it may be inserted in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHEPPARD'S speech is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, important as is the prohibition issue, it is far transcended by the question of law enforcement. When prohibition became a part of the American Constitution it became the cause of every true American, wet or dry. The question of law enforcement involves the very existence of our civilization—the preservation of our form of government.

No other human enactment affords a finer example of stability, justice, and progress than the Constitution of the United States. It has supplied the governmental structure with which our federated, representative Republic has had a growth so splendid, so gigantic, as to outstrip and to amaze the world. Practically every other nation of any appreciable degree of importance has been compelled by the emergencies of modern history to adopt virtually a new form of government since our Constitution came into existence, and yet our Constitution remains, gathering vigor from every crisis, vitality from every upheaval. What is that marvelous quality which has enabled our Federal form of government, our national Constitution, to adapt itself to the most changeable and revolutionary periods of recorded time? The ability of our Federal Constitution to meet developing needs and problems lies in the general nature of the powers it defines, in the principles it establishes for the protection of individual rights, in its definition of the spheres of the State and Nation, and in the method it provides for its own

amendment. It confers upon three-fourths of the States the right to change its provisions or to attach new provisions at any time, the sole exception relating to the equal representation of the States in the United States Senate. It thus becomes a living organism applicable to any situation which an adequate number of its constituent elements, the States, may deem sufficiently serious to call for the exercise of the amending power. Thus it has been able to protect the Nation from the perils of decay and dissolution, to preserve for it an ordered and progressive life that means everything for the well-being of the American people.

It is well, therefore, that we should never cease to venerate, to study, and to uphold the American Constitution—the very heart and body of our National Government. It is well that we should never forget the truths proclaimed by Washington in the course of his famous farewell address to the American people, namely, that respect for the authority of our Government, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty; that the basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government; that the Constitution, however, which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory on all; that the very idea of the power and right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government; that all obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberation and action of the constituted authorities are destructive of this fundamental principle and of fatal tendency.

With the eighteenth amendment embodied in the Constitution by the processes which the Constitution itself establishes, an amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages anywhere in the Nation, is it not clear that the makers, vendors, purchasers, and drinkers of bootleg liquor repudiate the teachings of Washington and violate every principle on which our Constitution and our Government rest? Guiltier than the professional criminals with whom they indirectly or directly deal are the purchasers and drinkers who move in social and business circles, without whom the bootleg market would disappear; guiltier because opportunity, education, and position make their conduct all the more without excuse; guiltier because they cover their contempt of government and law with a cloak of so-called respectability. When they break one law they invite the violation of all other laws. When they make the existence of the bootlegger possible to-day they can not be heard to complain; they can not consistently invoke the protection of society when the burglar, the rapist, or the murderer invades their homes to-morrow. With their property, their liberties, and their lives safeguarded by the Constitution they become ingrates as well as lawbreakers when they disregard it. Lawbreakers in high places do more to undermine the foundations of order and progress, to encourage communism, bolshevism, anarchy, crime, and red activities in general than all the denizens of the underworld. Their example is the chief cause of dissipation and lawlessness among younger people. The exuberances of youth, however, are soon exhausted. The realities and necessities connected with the earning of livelihoods nearly always form a sufficient antidote for them. It is the older "flapper" among the women and the older "flopper" among the men who constitute the incorrigible and noisy minority and who are the main source of whatever trouble there is. Oh, that the apparition of Washington might appear at every feast and revel where the eighteenth amendment is set at naught and with uplifted hand repeat these sentences from his parting message to America, sentences which can not be repeated too often: "The Constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory on all. The very idea of the power and right of the people to establish government presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government."

Less than a month ago I was in receipt of a letter from a citizen of this Nation who has put into practice the precepts of Washington, who has grasped the spirit of America. In the course of this letter he says: "Though only a moderate drinker, I quit promptly when the eighteenth amendment was ratified, not because I liked prohibition, but because a citizen who flouts the Constitution is like unto the bird that befouls its own nest, and I do not belong in that class." If every American would take a similar position to that of this citizen, so few wets would be left in the United States that even the partisan newspaper polls and partisan referendums with which they have kept up a futile courage in recent years would cease.

Nothing is more certain and more gratifying, however, than the fact that the great majority of the American people have adhered to the pronouncements of Washington and have maintained to this hour an unchanging and unchangeable loyalty to the Constitution and to the system it prescribes for its own alteration. Equally loyal have they been to the laws enacted to carry out its principles and provisions, because they have understood and still understand that the Constitution without statutes to carry it into execution is a dead and empty thing. Washington had this in mind when he said that all obstructions to the execution of the laws were destructive of popular

government. Lincoln had this in mind when, in his first inaugural address, he said: "Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution and the Union will endure forever." The Volstead Act is the statute passed by Congress to enforce the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Accurately may it be said that no statute in the history of the American Congress has been subjected to severer analysis and attack than the Volstead Act. The wets well understand that whereas it takes two-thirds of both Houses to submit and three-fourths of the States to ratify a repeal of the eighteenth amendment, the Federal statute which enforces it—namely, the Volstead Act—may be changed at any time by mere majorities in both Houses. An illustration of the inbred lawlessness of the liquor traffic, of its leprous effect even on those who support its return to a legalized status, is found in the fact that if the wets at any time should obtain majorities in both Houses of Congress they would not hesitate to destroy the eighteenth amendment by the changes they would make under the guise of amendments to the act enforcing it. This is shown in the constant efforts of the wets to amend the Volstead Act so as to secure light wine and beer. As a matter of fact, light wine and beer were the chief offenders of human decency and human welfare in the days before prohibition. Men and women, boys and girls, who went to hell by the alcoholic route started nearly always on light wine and beer. There is but one straightforward, honest American way to endeavor to bring back wine and beer and other liquids that intoxicate, and that is an appeal by discussion and persuasion to the American electorate to send Representatives to House and Senate who will submit to the States the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, followed by a similar appeal to the States to vote for that repeal. Prohibitionists took that course in securing national prohibition, their appeal being for adoption. The attempt to change the Constitution by a statutory enactment is an assault upon its fundamental character which, if successful, would bring it into permanent contempt. Let me present a plain and lucid formula for the benefit of the wets. The Constitution of the United States prohibits intoxicating liquors. Light wine and beer intoxicate. Ergo, any statutory provision for light wine and beer while the eighteenth amendment remains is violative of the Constitution of the United States. There is no greater tribute to the Volstead Act and the logic behind its provisions than the fact that after the election of four Congresses since its passage it retains the support of a tremendous majority in both Houses.

Prohibition is a fixture in the national household. This fact no political party may disregard without seriously impairing its influence in the Nation. The Volstead Act was based upon the experience of the United States Government in endeavoring to run down bootleggers and illicit distillers for 50 years in connection with the license system which prevailed before nation-wide prohibition. It will be seen, therefore, that the bootlegger and the moonshiner were here long before the eighteenth amendment. The Volstead Act was also based on the experiences of the States that had been enforcing local prohibition for many years. Both the United States Government and the prohibition States had found that the illicit liquor traffic could best be resisted by banning liquors with more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol. Purely as an administrative measure essential to effective enforcement the one-half of 1 per cent standard had been adopted by Federal and a number of State authorities long in advance of national prohibition, and the Volstead Act continued it with that end in view. It is not a substantive but an administrative definition of intoxicating liquor. It is an enforcement measure which has been found most effective against intoxicating liquor. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that even nonintoxicating liquors may be prohibited as a means of enforcing the prohibition of intoxicating liquors.

The Government does not "poison" ethyl alcohol when it approves formulas submitted by manufacturers of industrial alcohol in which from two to four parts of wood alcohol are added as denaturants for every 100 parts of ethyl alcohol. The law of 1906 requires manufacturers of industrial alcohol, in return for the privilege of withdrawing alcohol tax free, to submit a formula for a denaturant which will make more difficult the diversion of alcohol into bootlegging channels.

The law requires that wood alcohol, or a denaturant equally effective, be used. The denaturant is added not for purposes of "poison" but in order to make the industrial alcohol as malodorous and as nauseous as possible. As a matter of fact, the denatured alcohol, whether the denaturant be wood alcohol or otherwise, is no more destructive of life when put in beverage form than the ordinary undenatured ethyl alcohol itself.

The final test of the efficacy of the Constitution lies in its adequate enforcement. If it is to remain a living factor in our civilization the vigorous and vigilant application of the laws enacted to carry out its provisions is essential. The supremacy of the Constitution and the law is the concern of every true American. In this connection let it be said that enforcement officials in State and Nation of undoubted courage, pronounced ability, and unassailable integrity should be persistently and imperatively demanded. All others should be rejected, discredited, and condemned. Let it also be said of the officials in State and Nation who have had prohibition in charge since it was made a

part of the American Constitution that, on the whole, no braver, abler, and more capable body have ever discharged a more difficult and perilous task with more efficiency and success. The Department of Justice shows a remarkable record of convictions. General Andrews, Mrs. Willebrandt, Admiral Billard, of the Coast Guard, and their associates and workers in enforcement merit the thanks of the Nation. Defending, vitalizing, and applying the Constitution of the United States at its most hotly contested point, they are in a basic sense the preservers of our civilization. The men of the Coast Guard have performed as wonderful feats of danger and daring in behalf of the Constitution and the flag as ever marked the struggle of man with crime. Similarly have the men on shore distinguished themselves in the cause of law and order. Facing hardship and peril and death in the maintenance of orderly government in time of peace they deserve to rank with the heroes who defend their country on the battle field in time of war. Over 50 Federal prohibition officers have been killed in the course of duty since prohibition became effective in 1920, as well as a number of State officers.

I ask those gathered here to rise for a moment in honor of these and all other officers who have died in order that civilization might be perpetuated and that law might be enforced. God rest their souls in His eternal peace, and may their examples give us all a renewed and an inflexible resolve to continue our endeavors for the integrity of the Constitution, the majesty of the law, the happiness of the American people, and the spirit of the American flag.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. OVERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hildebran, in the State of North Carolina, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WILLIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lima, Mount Vernon, Wyoming, Mount Washington, Cincinnati, and Reading, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the prompt passage of the so-called White radio bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mount Hope, in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called alien deportation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COPELAND presented the following telegrams, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD:

(Telegram)

SYRACUSE, N. Y., January 6, 1927.

Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND,
Washington, D. C.:

Feel Parker-Phipps bill (maternity bill) very urgent. Hope you will support.

POLLY G. DYKE.

(Telegram)

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 6, 1927.

Senator COPELAND,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I do hope you will use all your strength and energy to help with the Sheppard-Towner bill. You have always been so good in the past I am sure we women can look to you for help this time. Best New Year greetings.

Mrs. DANIEL O'DAY.

REPORTS OF THE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4316) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service," approved October 6, 1917, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1219) thereon.

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2700) to amend the naval record of Frank H. Wilson, alias Henry Wencel, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1220) thereon.

Mr. COPELAND, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4405) for the relief of Farrah Dane Richardson, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1221) thereon.

Mr. ODDIE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8784) for the relief of Bertha M. Leville, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1222) thereon.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9433) for the relief of

Alexander Edward Metz, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1223) thereon.

Mr. HOWELL, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4820) authorizing certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy to accept foreign decorations, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1224) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4622) to authorize Capt. Walter S. Crosley and Paul P. Blackburn, United States Navy, to accept certain medals from the Republic of China, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1225) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 5090) for the relief of John E. Tucker; and

A bill (S. 5091) for the relief of Levi R. Whitted; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5092) authorizing and directing the discontinuance of the transport services of the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 5094) to enroll as citizens of the Choctaw Nation Daisy Crockett Coleman, Agnes Irene Coleman, and Verna Ruth Coleman, of Hillsboro, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCE:

A bill (S. 5095) for the relief of Oliver C. Macey and Marguerite Macey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5096) granting an increase of pension to Annie S. Hart (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5097) granting an increase of pension to Hattie L. Daly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ERNST:

A bill (S. 5098) for the relief of the Sunny Brook Distillery Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 5099) to prohibit appointment of Members of Congress to offices of the Federal Government for a period of two years after the expiration of their term of service in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYFIELD:

A bill (S. 5100) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 5101) granting a pension to Della Johnson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 5102) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Glynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 142) providing for the supplying of appropriate markers for the graves of veterans and scouts of Indian wars; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ADJUSTED COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts introduced a bill (S. 5093) to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the bill introduced by me amends the World War adjusted service compensation act, and would authorize the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to loan money to veterans holding adjusted-service certificates. The chief provisions of the bill are as follows:

Provision is made for making loans to holders of adjusted-service certificates at regional offices of the Veterans' Bureau all over the United States in exactly the same manner as loans are authorized through banks.

The rate of interest is fixed at 6 per cent. The present rate authorized for banks to charge is not more than 2 per cent of the rate fixed by the Federal Reserve Board for the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located. This works out at the present time to make the rate of interest from 7 to 9 per cent.

If the veteran fails to pay the principal and interest of the loan when it is matured or if the veteran fails to redeem certificate before its maturity, the same provisions apply as in the case of loans through banks.

The director is authorized to make loans out of the adjusted-service certificate fund in his possession and for which an appropriation is made each year.

In addition an appropriation is authorized for such sums of money as may be necessary outside of this adjusted-service certificate fund.

I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance. The motion was agreed to.

BANK LOANS ON INSURANCE CERTIFICATES

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I ask that the clerk may read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 320), as follows:

Senate Resolution 320

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury, as ex officio member and chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, be requested to report to the Senate what, if any, plans the board has for making possible the carrying into effect section 502 of the adjusted compensation act of May 19, 1924.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is it proper for me to state the reason why?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there is no objection to the resolution. I think it only fair to state, however, that it is generally believed that the law was not thoroughly understood by the bankers, and now some of the bankers are making the loans.

Mr. COPELAND. I think that this matter is of tremendous importance and of interest to every Senator, if the mail of other Senators is like my mail. It was filled this morning with letters from ex-service men who are outraged because they find their certificates are not accepted as collateral for bank loans. To keep faith with these men we must find a way to facilitate such loans.

Mr. CURTIS. As I said, I have no objection to the resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 321), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate Resolution 321

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 205, continuing the employment by the Committee on the District of Columbia of a resident assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until the end of the Sixty-ninth Congress hereby is further continued in full force and effect until June 30, 1927.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LENROOT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 322), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Senate Resolution 322

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Sixty-ninth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

FRENCH SPOILATION CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I move that Calendar No. 656, the bill (S. 62) for the allowance of certain claims for indemnity for spoiliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, as reported by the Court of Claims, be taken up at this time for consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Bruce	Dale	Fess
Bayard	Cameron	Deneen	Fletcher
Bingham	Capper	Dill	Frazier
Blease	Caraway	Edge	George
Borah	Copeland	Edwards	Gillett
Bratton	Couzens	Ernst	Glass
Broussard	Curtis	Ferris	Goff

Gooding	Keyes	Nye	Smoot
Gould	King	Oddie	Steck
Greene	La Follette	Overman	Stephens
Hale	Lenroot	Phipps	Stewart
Harrell	McKellar	Pine	Swanson
Harris	McLean	Pittman	Trammell
Harrison	McMaster	Reed, Mo.	Tyson
Hawes	McNary	Reed, Pa.	Wadsworth
Hedlin	Mayfield	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Howell	Means	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Johnson	Metcalf	Sackett	Warren
Jones, N. Mex.	Neely	Sheppard	Wheeler
Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Shipstead	Willis
Kendrick	Norris	Shortridge	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maryland that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 62, the French spoliation claims bill.

Mr. BRUCE. I believe it is permissible for me for five minutes to address myself to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable at this hour under the rule.

Mr. BRUCE. For five minutes have I not the right?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not under Rule VIII. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland. The motion was rejected.

TOLLS ON RED RIVER BRIDGES

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 674, the bill (S. 3889) to amend the interstate commerce act as amended in respect of tolls over certain interstate bridges. The purpose of the bill is to regulate tolls over the Red River, which constitutes the boundary line between Texas and Oklahoma. The amendment which I offer makes it purely a local measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. COUZENS. I object.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall have to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, I will ask Senators to withdraw their objections for just a moment. Under the present law the Secretary of War has the power to regulate the tolls upon bridges which are constructed over navigable streams. The Supreme Court held that the Red River west of the east boundary line of the State of Oklahoma is a non-navigable stream. The amendment which I offer simply gives the Secretary of War the power to regulate tolls upon the bridges constructed across the nonnavigable part of the Red River that constitutes the boundary line between Oklahoma and Texas. It is a purely local measure in which the States of Oklahoma and Texas are vitally interested. It will take only a moment to pass the bill, and I certainly hope no Senator will interpose an objection to the consideration of the measure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if this is not a navigable stream, I do not see where Congress has any control over it.

Mr. MAYFIELD. The Red River west of the east boundary line of the State of Oklahoma has been held to be nonnavigable. There are several toll bridges across that stream. Under the present law the Secretary of War has the right to regulate the tolls on bridges over navigable streams, but no power to regulate tolls over bridges across this river.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I say. Is the river navigable across which this bridge is to be built?

Mr. MAYFIELD. The bridges are already built, and the river over which they have been constructed is a nonnavigable stream as held by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Washington that there is an interstate road over the bridge from one State into another. It is a matter of no consequence, accordingly, whether the stream is navigable or otherwise.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, if it is a navigable stream the Government has control over it for navigation purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It likewise has in view of the fact that it is an interstate road.

Mr. MAYFIELD. The Red River is the boundary line between Oklahoma and Texas. These bridges are constructed across the Red River west of the east boundary line of Oklahoma, which has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States to be a nonnavigable stream.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does this bill put the control in the Secretary of War?

Mr. MAYFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why put it under the control of the Secretary of War?

Mr. MAYFIELD. Because he now has control to regulate tolls over bridges constructed over navigable streams.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If this is an interstate proposition, why not give control to the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. MAYFIELD. That is the way the bill was originally drawn.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is the way it ought to be.

Mr. MAYFIELD. I agree with the Senator from Washington but the Senator from Connecticut objected to the original bill. It was apparent that I could not pass the measure over his objection, and for that reason alone I offered the amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I inquire if the amendment which the Senator from Texas proposes to take the place of the original bill has been read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been read.

Mr. MAYFIELD. It has not been read, and I ask that it may now be read.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask that the amendment be read. After it shall have been read, I think there will be no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the tolls charged for transit over any bridge across the Red River between Texas and Oklahoma shall be subject to regulation by the Secretary of War in the same manner and with the same effect as tolls charged for transit over bridges constructed under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, as I understand, the object of the bill is to give the Secretary of War the jurisdiction over these bridges which he normally has over bridges across navigable streams.

Mr. MAYFIELD. That is correct. It is not a general bill; it applies particularly to the Red River which, by a certain decision, is not navigable at this point. I hope there will be no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why should the jurisdiction be given to the Secretary of War rather than to the body which usually regulates interstate commerce?

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator will realize that the Secretary of War has jurisdiction over bridges over navigable streams—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is for a reason that finds its basis in the Constitution of the United States and in the practice and laws of the country for a hundred years; but now it is proposed to vest in the War Department the jurisdiction to regulate transportation rates on bridges that have no relation to the subject matter of the national defense or of navigation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no, Mr. President. As I understand, this bill applies merely to that section of the Red River which the Supreme Court has decided is not navigable. It is not a general bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But I assume that if a bill be enacted affecting a bridge across a nonnavigable stream between two States, it would become necessarily a precedent for legislation in the future. I think the bill as originally presented is in proper form.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me, I will say that I prefer the bill in its original form, but several Senators objected to it. I offered the amendment because I would rather have it than no legislation at all.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. This proposition involves a good deal more than it appears to involve on its face. Never has the Secretary of War been a rate-making authority except as his duties in that particular have been associated with the subject of navigation and national defense. Now it is proposed to establish a precedent which will arise to confound us in the future, for undoubtedly many toll bridges will be constructed, as they have been constructed, across nonnavigable streams between States. I think that Senators had better think about this measure a little more.

Mr. MAYFIELD. I certainly hope that the States of Oklahoma and Texas may obtain relief in this particular situation. A number of bridges have been constructed across the Red River, which constitutes the boundary line between those States, the tolls on which are not regulated by any tribunal whatever.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is apparently a proper sphere of activity for the regulation of commerce, but why should the Secretary of War be intrusted with or charged with the responsibility of regulating commerce?

Mr. MAYFIELD. He has that power now as to bridges over navigable streams.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; but it grows out of the very fact of navigation on the streams.

Mr. BINGHAM. But the toll over the bridge has nothing to do with the depth of water under the bridge.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is begging the question.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The power the Secretary of War now has is merely incidental to the greater power with reference to navigation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. With reference to navigation and national defense.

Mr. BINGHAM. Since the Secretary has that power in connection with hundreds of bridges, why object to giving it to him in connection with a few more, so that the power may be exercised uniformly?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not object to the consideration of the bill, but I want to give notice—

Mr. MAYFIELD. Let us have a vote on the original bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Texas why it is that the highway commissions of the two States can not regulate the question of tolls? That is a matter as to which, it seems to me, the highway commissions of the two States may act.

Mr. MAYFIELD. The answer to the Senator's question is that the commerce over these bridges is purely interstate commerce, and the State highway commissions have no power to regulate interstate commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. They may do that by stipulating that they have control of the highway and that the bridge is a part of the highway.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will not insist that this measure shall be considered at this time. There are some of us who have very grave doubt about the wisdom of the policy proposed in this amendment. I shall not object, perhaps, to the original bill, but I think it is a matter of so much importance that it ought not to be taken up in the morning hour. If the Senator feels inclined to insist upon his request, I shall feel it my duty to object to the consideration of the measure at this time.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Let us vote, then, on the original bill.

Mr. WILLIS. No; I object to taking it up. I think it is so important that we ought not to try to thrash out a great policy of this kind in the morning hour.

Mr. MAYFIELD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3889.

Mr. LENROOT. May I ask when the bill was reported?

Mr. MAYFIELD. It was reported on April 24, 1926, nearly a year ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the roll was called.

Mr. OVERMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming has not voted.

Mr. OVERMAN. That Senator not having voted, as I have a general pair with him, I ask leave to withdraw my vote.

Mr. GILLETT (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. BROUSSARD (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. FLETCHER (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WARREN] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] are necessarily absent from the Chamber attending a meeting of the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—45

Ashurst	Fletcher	McMaster	Sheppard
Bayard	George	Mayfield	Shipstead
Blease	Glass	Means	Steck
Bratton	Harrell	Neely	Stephens
Broussard	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Bruce	Harrison	Phipps	Tyson
Cameron	Haves	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	
Edwards	King	Robinson, Ark.	
Ferris	McKellar	Sackett	

NAYS—30

Bingham	Fess	Jones, Wash.	Oddie
Borah	Frazier	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.
Caraway	Gillett	Lenroot	Shortridge
Couzens	Gould	McLean	Smoot
Curtis	Greene	McNary	Wadsworth
Deneen	Hale	Metcalf	Willis
Edge	Howell	Norbeck	
Ernst	Johnson	Nye	

NOT VOTING—20

Capper	Keyes	Schall	Swanson
du Pont	Moses	Simmons	Underwood
Gerry	Overman	Smith	Warren
Goff	Pepper	Stanfield	Watson
Gooding	Ransdell	Stewart	Weller

So Mr. MAYFIELD's motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3889) to amend the interstate commerce act, as amended, in respect of tolls over certain interstate bridges.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BRUCE. Is this bill subject to debate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. BRUCE. Then I wish to express my views with respect to it with the measure of relevancy that usually obtains in this body. I wish to lay before my associates in the Senate the facts surrounding the bill which I have in vain for three years endeavored to have considered by the Senate. I refer to the bill commonly known as the French spoliation claims bill.

Twice since I have been a Member of this body it has come up for consideration in the Committee on Claims of this body; and every effort that ingenuity could suggest was resorted to to prevent a favorable report by that committee on it; but on each occasion, after the fullest discussion and consideration by the committee, the bill was favorably reported to this body. Once, on a motion to take it up for consideration, the Senate decided to take it up; but action on it was defeated by the insistence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] that it should be read word for word. It is a very voluminous bill, and when 2 o'clock came the bill had not been more than half read through.

Since that time every effort that I have made, either by day or by night, during our day sessions or our night sessions, to get the bill up has been unavailing. Two days ago or three days ago—I forget which—a motion made by me to take it up was unsuccessful. This morning a similar motion by me to take it up was likewise unsuccessful.

As I said the other day, when I think of some of the trivial, I had almost said despicable, forms of obstruction, personal or otherwise, by which the consideration of this bill has been defeated, I can not but recall the famous observation of John Bright in the English Parliament that he had known even an express train flying at the rate of 60 miles an hour between London and Liverpool to be derailed by a small donkey.

Of course such puerile agencies would be utterly futile to prevent this bill from coming up for consideration, but for the crude, antiquated, and tyrannical rules by which the course of procedure of this body is dominated.

I do not agree in some respects with the views that the Vice President entertains of our rules. The trouble here, as I see it, is not that we can not apply closure when closure is really needed, though the Vice President is of a different opinion, and his conclusions in that regard are eminently entitled to respect, as are all his conclusions. Under our recently adopted Rule XXII we can, in my opinion, when there is any true, certainly when there is any extreme exigency, force closure. Since I have been here we have done that twice—twice most effectively and conclusively. Whenever any pressing occasion arises for closure in this body, I think that we have rules enough to apply it. But the real vice that inheres in these rules of ours is the inability of any Member of the Senate, in the course of orderly procedure, to obtain with any certainty a hearing for some measure in which he is interested, and to have the dis-

cussion go on uninterruptedly until the measure is finally disposed of.

In the only other legislative assembly of which I was ever a member, the Legislature of Maryland, every bill came up in its regular place on the calendar, just as every case in court comes up in its regular place on the court calendar, unless some particular matter of unusual importance had, by the action of the assembly, been made a special order for some particular hour on some particular day. The result of that rule, of course, was that except where the house deemed something to be of such great importance as properly to be made the subject of a special order every member of the assembly, no matter how humble he might be, no matter how popular or unpopular personally he might be, had an opportunity to have measures with reference to which his constituents were deeply concerned considered, and considered continuously and finally passed upon.

No such privilege is enjoyed here. If you believe nobody else who tells you so, believe me, because I stand before you an illustration of the fact. For no less than three years as a Member of this body I have endeavored in vain to have the Senate act upon this French spoliation claims bill. Twice has it been put by the steering committee of the Republican Party in this body upon its steering program, but, somehow or other, even the steering gear of the steering committee of the Republican Party is insufficient to pilot this bill through the shoals of obstruction that beset our rules.

Recollecting the old line that "Colors seen by candlelight are not the same as seen by day," after endeavoring ineffectually to get this bill up during daylight, I have tried to get it up after dark during one of our nocturnal sessions, always with the same result. Such are the conditions that create the grave, the indefensible vice that lurks in these rules of ours; and, of course, that vice embodies the very essence of injustice, as does everything that denies a man a hearing of his case, whether on the floor of a legislative body or outside of it. Then, of course—though for once, it seems, I have no cause to complain of the fact—the second reproach, if I may use such a strong expression, that attaches to the practical workings of these rules of ours is the hopeless irrelevancy of debate that they invite.

The Vice President may not have put his finger upon the very seat of the disease, he may not have diagnosed his case with absolute correctness of judgment, but that our rules should be overhauled and revised and brought into conformity with the cardinal, elemental principles of justice, order, and expediency I do not see how anyone can doubt.

No wonder that such a widespread, deep-seated feeling of popular dissatisfaction exists throughout the United States with these rules, and no wonder that they should, perhaps to a greater extent than anything else, have brought this body more or less into popular disrepute.

What is it I am asking? Here are these French spoliation claims, which Chief Justice Marshall, almost at the beginning of the last century, pronounced just claims that should be recognized and honored by the Government.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRUCE. I regret to say that it is impossible for me to do so.

It was natural enough that differences of opinion should have prevailed with regard to their reasonableness and justice at that time—

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. And later until some tribunal was created by the Government for the purpose of judicially passing upon such claims. Finally that tribunal was created in the Court of Claims. The Federal Government surrendered its high prerogative of nonsuability and consented, subject to certain conditions, to be made a respondent in the Court of Claims.

In 1885 all of these French spoliation claims were referred by Congress to the Court of Claims. The court announced that everybody who wished to assert one of them against the Government should do so by a certain date, failing which he would be forever debarred from pressing his claim, and then the Court of Claims took up for consideration each and every one of the claims.

Of course, in many cases it was difficult to prove the devolution of the claim from the original claimants. The Court of Claims brought a most circumspect, jealous, searching spirit to the examination of the claims, and it held that some 70 per cent of them all were not duly established, and those claims, of course, are not included in the present bill.

As to the remainder of the claims, it granted a hearing, the Government being fully represented by its legal department, it

afterwards granted a rehearing, and 25 years later, when the personnel of the court had undergone a profound change, it heard the claims again. After all that consideration, after all that argument, after all that hearing and rehearing, what was the result? This court—for bear in mind, Mr. President, that is what it was—held that all the claims that it reported back to Congress were valid, reasonable, and just claims, in its judgment.

Since that time President Taft has twice in his messages to Congress urged it to make the necessary appropriations for the payment of the claims, and at a recent session of Congress President Coolidge, in his annual message to Congress, urged their payment as a just debt due by the Government to a group of its citizens. Pursuant to the action of the Court of Claims Congress has made no less than four appropriations for the payment of similar French spoliation claims, first an appropriation on March 3, 1891, of \$1,304,095.37; then on March 3, 1899, of \$1,055,473.04; then on May 27, 1902, of \$798,631.27; and then on February 24, 1905, of \$752,660.93, making a total of \$3,910,860.61 of French spoliation claims favorably reported upon by the Court of Claims and paid by the Federal Government pursuant to appropriations duly made by the two houses of Congress. The only reason in the world why there are any remaining French spoliation claims to-day at all which have not been paid is because all the claims were reported back to Congress by the Court of Claims as they were passed upon by that court, and the claims that were last reported upon, of course, had to come up for consideration by Congress later than those that were earlier reported.

The claims which remain unpaid amount to \$3,248,202.47, and, as I have said, their payment has been twice favorably reported upon by the Senate Committee on Claims since I have been a Member of the Senate.

An attempt has been made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] to draw a distinction between such of the pending claims as are preferred on behalf merely of individual claimants and such of them as are preferred on behalf of insurance companies. There is no substantial distinction whatsoever, I say as a lawyer, to be taken between the two classes of claims. Everybody knows that no matter what premium an insurance company may receive, when there is a loss it is entitled to be subrogated to any pecuniary benefit or advantage to which the insured is entitled in the premises. In other words, the consideration for which insurance is effected is, first, the annual premium, or a lump premium which may be paid when the policy is issued, and then the agreement of the assured that if there is any salvage when a loss takes place, that salvage which would otherwise inure to the insured is to inure to the insurer.

That is a legal principle with which every lawyer is thoroughly conversant. It has been approved over and over again, I may say without exaggeration, by a vast number of State decisions. It has been approved by the Supreme Court of the United States. It has even been approved by the supreme court of Nebraska, the State represented by Senator HOWELL. So the insurance companies which insured such of these ships as were seized by the French are entitled to any appropriations made by Congress in the case of ships insured by them. In point of fact, the Government has recognized its obligation to pay the insurance companies in such cases, as well as individual claimants.

Some of the seizures of American vessels took place on the high seas in the case of vessels that were afterwards brought into Spanish ports, and those seizures were made the subjects of treaty arrangements between this country and the foreign country involved, and thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars for losses occasioned by the seizures were in consequence paid to the insurance companies.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am interested in what the Senator said about the insurance companies having the right to be subrogated. Of course, that would not be true unless the Government itself would have been liable, in case the ships had not been insured. I have not studied these matters sufficiently to know—and I have forgotten some of the things I did learn when I was studying them—and I would like to have the Senator explain how it is that the insurance companies have a legal right to be subrogated and to claim the money that would otherwise go to the claimants.

Mr. BRUCE. That is the principle that applies not only to this case, but to every case where there has been an insurance loss.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not contradicting the Senator's legal proposition, but subrogation does not apply, as a matter of law,

unless the party whom it is attempted to make liable would otherwise have been liable, regardless of the subrogation. The Government primarily is not liable.

Mr. BRUCE. I am not going into the question as to whether the Government legally and technically speaking could be held liable for any of these claims, whether the claims were urged by insurance companies or by individual claimants, but what I mean to say is that as claimants insurance companies stand on exactly the same footing as individuals, legally, morally, and in every other respect, in my humble judgment. In other words, there is no substantial reason why any distinction should be taken between insurance company claimants, under this bill, and other claimants.

Mr. NORRIS. I may not have made myself clear.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes, you have.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not understand why an insurance company has any right to be subrogated and to get a claim paid by the Government unless the Government would have been liable if there had been no insurance policy issued. In other words, let us say, for instance, that a railroad company destroys a piece of property that is insured and an insurance company pays the loss. The insurance company might sue the railroad company then for their loss and recover, providing they could show that the loss came about on account of the negligence of the railroad company. In other words, they would have to make the same case against the railroad company that the person owning the property would have had to make if he had not had his property insured, and had sued the railroad company, instead of collecting from the insurance company.

Mr. BRUCE. Under the principle of subrogation it is only where there is some salvage, something to be snatched from the wreck or the loss or the destruction, that the rule of subrogation applies. For instance, a marine insurance company undertakes to insure a bottom and there is a partial loss. The marine insurance company is not only entitled to the premium which it has received on the risk which it has assumed, but it is entitled to all salvage that attends the loss. It is entitled, if it chooses, to assert its right to so much of the hull or other remainder of the vessel as survives. Indeed, if there is any pecuniary benefit or advantage of any description connected with the loss which, apart from the insurance, would inure to the owner, it inures to the benefit of the insurer.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the case the Senator puts would depend on the circumstances. If there was not a complete loss and the insurance company had not paid for the value of the property, it would not be entitled to get what was left. The owner would have that. But I do not think that bears on my question of the right of the insurance company in this case to be subrogated. It seems to me that in order for the insurance company to show a legal or equitable right to subrogation it would have to show that the Government was liable and that if the property had not been insured the owner of the property could have collected his money from the Government.

Mr. BRUCE. No; all he has to show is that the Government was liable to the owner of the ship; and that being established, it follows as a matter of course that the insurance company is entitled to the insurance benefit whatever it be.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that the case here? Was the Government liable?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; I think so. It has been so held. I am not going into the question as to whether the Government would be technically suable, because we know the Government can not be sued as freely as individuals.

Mr. NORRIS. I would not want to rule on that; but it seems to me I would want to know that the Government was legally liable.

Mr. BRUCE. It was liable for this reason: In the treaty of 1778 between the United States and France this country undertook to guarantee to France the possession of her colonies in the West Indies, and also undertook to extend the hospitality of its ports to prizes brought in by France to those ports. I am very sorry to say that when ill feeling arose between France and the United States and a better state of feeling arose between Great Britain and the United States, we forgot those treaty obligations. We failed to live up to them, and our failure to do so was drawn into negotiation and discussion between France and ourselves. The result was that France released us from those treaty obligations and we took over the obligation of making good to our own citizens the losses which they had suffered at the hands of France, for which France would otherwise have been responsible.

That is the foundation on which these claims rest. That is the foundation on which they have been placed by Presidents Taft and Coolidge and by Chief Justice Marshall.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I would like to know why it was and upon what ground President Cleveland and also President Pierce vetoed a similar bill.

Mr. BRUCE. So far as President Pierce is concerned, that was long before the claims were ever referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication. There was no Court of Claims in his time. There was, in his time, no tribunal in which the Government could be sued. So it was natural enough that he should veto them.

Mr. MEANS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. MEANS. Will the Senator be so kind as to inform me whether he contemplates using all of the time until 2 o'clock, when the Senate will go into executive session?

Mr. BRUCE. I know that if I do not use it the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] certainly will.

Mr. MEANS. I am not trying to get the floor. I wanted to know, as I gave notice that I would speak to-day. Inasmuch as I have not the floor, and if the Senator intends to use it, I would like to know for my own convenience. It is only a courteous request I am making of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I know that any speech delivered by the Senator from Colorado is an event of profound significance, but, really, considering the difficulty that I have experienced in dealing with this subject at all, I regret to say that it is impossible for me to yield the floor to him or any other Senator.

Mr. MEANS. I do not ask the Senator to yield. He will occupy the time until 2 o'clock?

Mr. BRUCE. Oh, undoubtedly; and if I do not the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] unquestionably will.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Not just at this moment, I will say to the Senator, because I was asked a question by the Senator from North Carolina and had not completed my answer.

Mr. Cleveland was hostile to these claims. On what ground I do not know. I do not recall whether at that time they had been referred to the Court of Claims or not.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think the Court of Claims was established until after that time.

Mr. BRUCE. Precisely. If that is so, then, of course, it was perfectly natural that Mr. Cleveland should have had his own opinion, just as President Pierce had about the validity of these claims. I have been assured on most trustworthy information that Mr. Cleveland's hostility to the claims—if we can use such a term as hostility to describe his attitude toward them—was deeply regretted by him. It is one of the things connected with his administration as to which he afterwards expressed regret. The Senator knows that there is no one for whose opinion on political subjects I entertain a higher respect than President Cleveland, because I think, in all sincerity, that next to George Washington himself he more infallibly reached the correct conclusion finally in any case than any President in our history.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BRUCE. I do not know just how long the Senator's interruption may last. If he only wishes to ask a single question, I will yield.

Mr. HOWELL. I just want to quote from President Cleveland's message and ask if the Senator thinks that anything could possibly have occurred to change his views respecting these particular items. President Cleveland in his message said this, referring to the insurance companies in which the Senator from Maryland is interested:

These insurers by the terms of their policies undertook and agreed "to bear and take upon themselves all risks and perils of the sea, men-of-war, fire, enemies, rovers, thieves, jettison, letters of marque and counter-marque, reprisals, takings at sea, arrests, restraints, and detentions of all kings, princes, or peoples of what nation, condition, or quality whatsoever."

The premiums received on these policies were large, and the losses were precisely those within the contemplation of the insurers. It is well known that the business of insurance is entered upon with the expectation that the premiums received will pay all losses and yield a profit to the insurers in addition; and yet, without any showing that

the business did not result in a profit to these insurance claimants, it is proposed that the Government shall indemnify them against the precise risks they undertook, notwithstanding the fact that the money appropriated is not to be paid (as held by the United States Supreme Court) "except by way of gratuity, payments as of grace and not of right."

That was the statement of President Cleveland.

Mr. BRUCE. I am very glad that the Senator read the words. I have already said that Mr. Cleveland was hostile to these claims. But as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has stated, that was before the claims became the subject of adjudication by the Court of Claims.

Mr. HOWELL. This was written in 1894.

Mr. BRUCE. The claims were referred in 1885.

Mr. HOWELL. It was after the Court of Claims afforded information to the Congress to guide its action.

Mr. BRUCE. If that is so, the President undertook to set up his own individual judgment against the judgment of a judicial tribunal to which the claims had been referred and which had heard them once, if not twice, and reheard them on one occasion. I have great respect for Mr. Cleveland as a statesman, but my respect for him as a lawyer is by no means so great. I say that those statements of his apparently disclose a very lamentable lack of information on his part in relation to the legal principle of subrogation.

Mr. HOWELL rose.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sorry, but I have only a certain amount of time and it is impossible to yield to the Senator further.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BRUCE. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator referred to a judicial determination of the rights of the claimants by proper tribunals. As I understand, the Court of Claims has jurisdiction to determine the amount in each instance, but they did not determine the liability or the rights of the parties. They simply determined what each party would be entitled to in case he did have a claim, and in case Congress found that he did have a claim. The court simply determined in that event the amount to which he would be entitled.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator is at fault. The majority report of the committee in this case says among other things:

Judge Howry, regarding the unanimous opinion of the court, said—
And I ask Senators to listen to these words:

The spoliation claims as a class were valid obligations from France to the United States, and our Government surrendered them to France for a valuable consideration benefiting the Nation, and this use of the claims raised an obligation founded upon right.

I especially call the attention of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to that language.

As I said, I am assured that Mr. Cleveland, after he ceased to be President of the United States, expressed his profound regret that he should have assumed the adverse attitude which he did toward these claims. But, as I also said, President Taft twice recommended their payment and President Coolidge also recommended their payment. They have met with the approval of the very greatest men in our history, such men as Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Charles Sumner, and many other illustrious and famous men in American history, and never, until the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HOWELL] rendered his adverse minority report in this case, had any adverse minority report been rendered in reference to the claims by any committee of the Senate. Over and over again they have been approved. I forget exactly how many times, but I know time after time.

The majority report had this to say with regard to the insurance feature of these claims:

The claims of the insurance companies are identical with the claims that have been paid, except in the fact that they happen to be held by corporations instead of by individuals.

In that connection I may say that instead of the insurance companies as a whole having derived in the end any profit from the insurance of these ships which were destroyed during that collision between France and the United States, as I understand it every solitary one of them, with the exception of two, as the result of the losses they had to pay had to go into bankruptcy.

The court went on to say:

Like all other French spoliation claims, they were referred by Congress to the Court of Claims to be adjudicated both as to the facts and as to law, and after the fullest possible argument pro and con the court unanimously found in favor of the companies in identically the same manner as for the other claimants.

Congress has recognized the claims of insurance corporations in their French spoliation losses, as follows:

First. French spoiliations, where the ships were condemned in Spanish ports. Thirty-one insurance companies were reimbursed for their losses, aggregating \$1,486,929.58, from the allowance made by Spain under the treaty of February 22, 1819.

Second. French spoiliations since July 31, 1801, where the ships were condemned in French ports. Fifty-two insurance companies were reimbursed on account of their losses, aggregating \$1,760,699.21, from the allowance made by France under the treaty of July 4, 1831.

Third. French spoiliations prior to July 31, 1801, where the ships were condemned in French ports. (This is the class to which all the present unsettled French spoliation claims belong.) Two insurance companies were paid for their losses aggregating \$26,860, under the act of Congress dated March 3, 1891.

In other words, under other treaties than the treaty that we are dealing with in connection with the pending bill, insurance companies did file their claims and did have their claims paid; and even under the treaty that is involved in the present discussion two claims of insurance companies have already been paid.

I have been drawn quite far afield in undertaking to discuss the merits of the French spoliation claims bill, but I do not regret that I have done so. All that I say to my brother Senators is that I am not asking you to pass it; I have no right to do that; your opinion about its merits is quite as trustworthy as mine, if not trustworthier. I am simply expressing my opinion of the merits of the bill as I see them, but I do ask you, one and all, to assist me in bringing up the bill itself for a hearing. If you will only do that, even should your decision with regard to it be unfavorable, I shall not lack the philosophy to acquiesce without the slightest repining in your conclusion. I do think, however, that the Senate owes it to its own credit as well as to the claimants whose claims are set forth in the bill and to a brother Senator to allow the bill to come up and to be considered upon its merits or demerits and to dispose of it as Senators may conscientiously believe that it should be disposed of. Of course, I intend at the very first opportunity that arises to renew my motion for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the claims which have been known as French spoliation claims accrued in the eighteenth century, more than 126 years ago. They have been before Congress almost constantly since the beginning of the last century. For 40 years Congress refused to consider these claims. After more than a generation had elapsed, two Presidents vetoed bills for a partial payment of these claims. These bills were not passed until all who had personally known about the origin of these claims and the circumstances and connections therewith had passed from the scene. In the meantime the new generation coming on more than doubled the number of claimants. Following the second presidential veto of these claims by President Pierce, the claimants did not succeed in getting under way again before the advent of the Civil War, during and after which there was a period of quiescence in the clamor for the payment of these gratuities. However, in the eighties Congress was again besieged, not so much by individual claimants, as by that time their numbers had so increased that the interest of each was comparatively trifling, but by insurance companies whose stake was undivided and as great then as at the close of the French spoiliations in 1801. As a consequence the insurance companies came and urged Congress to recognize and pay these claims.

In order that the Senate may realize the interest of these insurance claimants, I will read a list thereof, together with the claims included in the pending bill.

There is the receiver of the Maryland Insurance Co. of Baltimore, Md. (the city of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Mr. BRUCE), which claims \$286,235.99, and if this bill shall be passed that company will benefit to this extent. Then there is the receiver of the Boston Marine Insurance Co., \$49,659.53; the New Haven Insurance Co., \$43,496.70; the receiver of the New York Insurance Co., \$36,779.04; the receiver of the Marine Insurance Office, \$27,850; the Marine Insurance Co. of Alexandria, \$9,471.75; the trustee of the Columbian Insurance Co., \$15,680; the trustee of the Providence-Washington Insurance Co., \$23,112.92; the Newport Insurance Co., \$7,091.76; the receiver of the Baltimore Insurance Co.—another insurance company in Maryland—\$154,362.74; the trustee of the United Insurance Co. of New York, \$76,928.98; the Insurance Co. of North America, \$726,419.23; and the Insurance Co. of Pennsylvania, \$463,439.31. These insurance claims total \$1,919,527.95.

But few individual claimants were longer importuning Congress, but these insurance companies were here in the eighties

urging the Congress to pass a bill for their relief. As a consequence, as is often the case, Congress "passed the buck." It said, "We will leave this to the Court of Claims but with the provision that the Court of Claims shall have no right or authority to render a judgment against the United States." All the Court of Claims could do was to investigate the facts and report. Congress was finally to decide whether or not any claim should be paid.

The great question involved was as to whether in the latter part of the eighteenth century the United States was at war with France. The Attorney General of the United States at that time held that we were at war with France; the United States Supreme Court about that time held that we were at war with France; George Washington had been recalled to the command of the Army; our Navy had been directed to capture French commercial vessels as prizes and attack French national vessels wherever found; and that period is not wanting, Mr. President, in brilliant achievements by our naval commanders. We were, indeed, at war. The first ship that I sailed on as a midshipman was the U. S. S. *Constellation*, which captured the French frigate *l'Insurgente* in 1799, receiving 40 shots through the hull during the engagement. The Court of Claims acknowledged that we were at war with France, but they said the war was limited to the seas. Of course it was limited to the seas. Now, this is important in connection with these claims. If we were at war, there could be no valid claim against the United States because all claims against France would have been wiped out so far as the destruction and capture of certain American vessels was concerned. That is acknowledged; but the Court of Claims begged the question, and said it was a limited war, limited to the ocean. Now, of course, a war is a war, whether it is limited to the ocean or limited to land operations, or whether it involves both classes of operations.

After the Court of Claims had presented the facts to Congress in 1889, I think, or 1888, a bill was passed allowing certain of these claims, and that bill was signed by President Harrison; but all were individual claims, every one except two. Two were insurance claims that were slipped in, unknown to the committee and to Congress. Later other bills were passed. The next one was during the second term of President Cleveland; but in that bill there was a provision that not any one of these claims should be paid to an insurance company—eliminating insurance claims—and every subsequent act specifically eliminated insurance companies.

Why? In 1793 France declared war against Great Britain, Prussia, the United Netherlands, Sardinia, and Austria, if I remember rightly, and from that time on the commerce of the United States flourished tremendously. We were a neutral nation. They demanded our supplies. The profits were tremendous; but France began to prey upon our vessels. The consequence was that insurance rates began to jump. A number of insurance companies were organized as a result. Prior to 1792 the rate for a voyage was about 2½ per cent. The rate went up almost immediately to 33 per cent and more.

In this connection I propose to read an extract from the report of the minority of the Committee on Claims respecting this bill:

During the period of the French spoiliations all Europe was in arms and American commerce flourished as never before. This situation, combined with the risk of capture on the high seas and confiscation, created a tremendous demand for marine insurance and at rates previously quite unknown.

Thus in 1792 the premiums for voyages ran about 2½ per cent, but shortly thereafter they began rapidly to increase and reached as high as 33 per cent and more. In short, the demands for insurance outstripped the resources of private underwriters, and as a consequence numbers of insurance companies were organized.

Of course, this was all due to the fact that during this period the business of underwriting had become highly profitable. Nevertheless these same insurers are catalogued among those seeking gratuities under the pending bill, their claim being that they were legally subrogated to the rights of policyholders who sustained spoliation losses, the whole or part of which the insurers paid.

The indefensible character of such claims was clearly presented by President Cleveland, as follows, in the veto message previously referred to.

Which he delivered, I think, in 1894 or 1895, some 9 or 10 years after the findings of the Court of Claims referred to. This is what President Cleveland said with reference to these insurance claims:

These insurers by the terms of their policies undertook and agreed "to bear and taken upon themselves all risks and perils of the sea, men-of-war, fire, enemies, rovers, thieves, jettison, letters of marque and counter-marque, surprisals, takings at sea, arrests, restraints, and detain-

ments of all kings, princes, or peoples of what nation, condition, or quality whatsoever."

He was quoting from a clause in these insurance policies. To continue:

The premiums received on these policies were large, and the losses were precisely those within the contemplation of the insurers. It is well known that the business of insurance is entered upon with the expectation that the premiums received will pay all losses and yield a profit to the insurers in addition; and yet, without any showing that the business did not result in a profit to these insurance claimants, it is proposed that the Government shall indemnify them against the precise risks they undertook, and notwithstanding the fact that the money appropriated is not to be paid (as held by the United States Supreme Court) "except by way of gratuity, payments as of grace and not of right."

That was to be the character of these payments if made. This is the end of the quotation from President Cleveland's message vetoing the bill.

President Cleveland instinctively pointed out the vital defect and indefensible feature of these claims. A loss suffered by an individual implies a misfortune, but not so with insurers. The losses of an insurance company constitute the reason for its existence, as, for instance, it must be evident that if there were no marine losses there would be no marine insurance companies.

Prior to 1793 these insurers had charged for voyages, as previously stated, a rate of about 2½ per cent, but after the French spoliations began this rate was often increased as much as 1,000 per cent or more, due to the fact that the policies guaranteed against men-of-war, enemies, letters of marque and counter-marque, surprisals, takings at sea, and detentions of all kings, princes, or peoples whatsoever.

As a consequence the losses were precisely within the contemplation of the insurers, and the rate was ample not only to pay the losses sustained but also to afford an underwriting profit.

UNDERWRITING PROFITS ENJOYED

That concrete examples of underwriting experience for that period might be available, the various claimants were requested to appear before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Claims. However, but two presented themselves for interrogation, viz, the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania and the Insurance Co. of North America.

In the case of the first company it was developed that it was organized and incorporated in 1794 with a capital of \$500,000; that for the years immediately following it wrote marine insurance, but some time after the termination of the French spoliations it gave up this form of underwriting and devoted itself to other lines.

It found marine underwriting unprofitable after the French spoliation ceased.

It was further developed that during the period in question its underwriting profits, after deducting all expenses, approximated 8 per cent, not including income from other sources, such as interest on capital and premium reserves invested, which probably doubled this return.

Notwithstanding these facts, this company, under the provisions of this bill, is to receive gratuities amounting to \$463,439.31, not for the mitigation of misfortunes endured, but to the end of increasing the large profits enjoyed during the period of its marine underwriting.

In the case of the Insurance Co. of North America, it appears from a history of that organization, published in 1885 by authority of its board of directors, that although the company was not incorporated until 1794 it began to issue policies as an unincorporated association in December, 1792. The spoliations beginning shortly thereafter, the success of the enterprise was almost instant, as indicated in the following quotation taken from the history referred to:

"The marine premiums written to the close of the year 1793 amounted to \$213,465.31, and the losses paid to \$38,484.16. In 1794 the premiums were \$290,656.83, and they increased to \$1,304,208.91 in 1798, when they began to decrease, and in 1802 they were but \$103,902.26. This first decade showed premiums written \$6,037,456.71, and losses paid \$5,500,887.57."

From the above it will be noted that the excess of premiums above losses for the period covered was \$536,569.14, to which should be added, to determine the net profit, income from other sources, such as interest on capital and premium reserves invested, less expenses.

As a result of the remarkable success of the company a 6 per cent dividend was paid at the end of the first six months of its existence and 6 per cent at the end of the next six months. During the next four years the dividends averaged about 28 per cent, and the year following they were 20 per cent.

PROFITS DUE TO SPOILIATIONS

From a consideration of this data it is evident that the French spoliations were a godsend to the company, as to all other insurers of that day, because as soon as the French depredations terminated, about 1801, the companies' premiums dropped from \$1,082,113.58 in

1800 to \$103,902.26 in 1802, and reached the low-water mark of \$5,843.55 in 1808.

Although the company is still in business, it is a significant fact that its marine insurance premiums, according to the last report at hand, that for 1923, did not reach the total written in 1798. As a matter of fact, during the decade that witnessed the French spoliations this company was highly prosperous, whereas for every decade during the next 30 years it lost money as a result of its marine underwriting.

Yet in the face of these facts this bill, S. 62, proposes to take out of the Public Treasury \$748,906.13 and present it as a gratuity to this corporation that its handsome underwriting profits for the period in question may be more than doubled. It is because of such facts as these that the undersigned have refused to concur in the report of the majority of the committee.

R. B. HOWELL.
GERALD P. NYE.
PARK TRAMMELL.
T. H. CARAWAY.
EARLE B. MAYFIELD.

Mr. President, these claims are not legal claims against the United States. They are equitable claims, if claims at all, and he who asks equity must do equity. If these insurance companies demand that we shall pay their losses during that period, then the Government is entitled to the premiums they collected.

The real losers were not the insurance companies. They made profits, tremendous profits, and now they ask us, after 125 years, to increase their profits. The real losers were those who were compelled to pay the excessive insurance premiums, and if anyone should be reimbursed it is these persons or their heirs.

It is for this reason I am opposing these French spoliation claims. They are without justice, and the people of this country should not have imposed upon them the additional burden of paying these insurance companies \$1,900,000.

TOLLS ON RED RIVER BRIDGES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3889) to amend the interstate commerce act, as amended, in respect of tolls over certain interstate bridges.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I sent to the desk some time ago to the pending bill, and offer the following amendment in lieu thereof.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As a substitute for the bill?

Mr. MAYFIELD. I offer it as a substitute for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof:

That the Railroad Commission of Texas and the Corporation Commission of Oklahoma are hereby authorized through joint or concurrent action, upon complaint or upon their own initiative without complaint, and after notice and hearing, to prescribe the tolls to be thereafter charged for transit over any bridge across the Red River between Texas and Oklahoma not subject to regulation by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Railroad Commission of Texas and the Corporation Commission of Oklahoma to regulate tolls charged for transit over certain bridges across the Red River."

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MEANS obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dale	Harreld	McNary
Bayard	Dill	Harris	Mayfield
Bingham	Edge	Harrison	Means
Blease	Edwards	Hawes	Neely
Borah	Ernst	Heflin	Norris
Bratton	Ferris	Howell	Nye
Broussard	Fess	Johnson	Oddie
Bruce	Fletcher	Jones, Wash.	Overman
Cameron	Frazier	Kendrick	Phipps
Capper	Gillett	La Follette	Pine
Caraway	Glass	Lenroot	Pittman
Copeland	Goff	McKellar	Reed, Mo.
Conzens	Gooding	McLean	Reed, Pa.
Curtis	Hale	McMaster	Robinson, Ark.

Robinson, Ind.
Sackett
Shoppard
Shipstead

Smoot
Steck
Stephens
Swanson

Trammell
Tyson
Wadsworth
Warren

Wheeler
Willis

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are detained in attendance on a committee of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MEANS. Mr. President, on yesterday I gave notice that I would endeavor to address myself to the question of national defense. Owing to the location of my seat, perhaps, or my inability to be heard, I was unable to receive recognition from the Chair this morning. I am now informed that at the hour of 2 o'clock we will not enter executive session, and therefore I will be privileged to occupy the floor at this time.

MATERNITY AND INFANT HYGIENE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7555) to authorize for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1928, and June 30, 1929, appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1921.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MEANS. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] requested me to announce that there will be no executive session this afternoon on the Lausanne treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am rising to a question of privilege. The Senator will just let me make this statement for the RECORD. The Chair has announced that he lays before the Senate the unfinished business and that it is Senate bill 7555. I do not want to let the announcement pass so that it will appear that the Senate has acquiesced in the declaration that it is the unfinished business. I shall not now interrupt the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, but I insist, and at the proper time I shall undertake to show, that that particular bill is not the unfinished business under the rules of the Senate.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MEANS. Mr. President, in the month of August last year, at the city of Des Moines, Iowa, the United Spanish War Veterans, in encampment assembled, expressed themselves by resolution grateful for the act of the Congress of the United States in the matter of the recognition of those men who served the country in 1898 in the war with Spain and the campaigns incident thereto. At the same time and as a further expression of their appreciation, and for that reason alone, they saw fit to elect a Member of this body to be their commander in chief.

Now they have requested me, as have other veteran organizations, to be their voice in the matter of national defense. The hour is propitious. Recent happenings have called it insistently to our minds. The attitude of the Director of the Budget and other administrative officers and the estimates of the War Department have called the matter forcibly to our minds. I want, therefore, to ask the privilege of reciting our views upon a question which I assure you to-day has the attention of the American people—the question of national preparedness.

These men whose voice I am privileged to be to-day—thousands upon thousands of them have reached the age, so the records tell me, of 53 years. They are possessors now of a conservative, deliberate, constructive thought. They have had the experiences which qualify each one of them to speak upon this question, which should demand the attention of every legislator, whether in this body or the body at the other end of the Capitol.

It was in 1897 that the country was stirred to demand the relief of those who lived in the isle of Cuba. We heard their aggrieved cry to be relieved from the burden of a yoke of tyranny and oppression which had been placed thereon by the monarchy of Spain. He who then was President of the United States, himself a service man, knew full well how unprepared this country was for such an emergency. He knew that we

had since the Civil War been slipping back, forgetting the needs of preparedness. At that time, in that year, and facing that emergency, he did not want to go to war. He hesitated, even after the sinking of the Maine, which occurred in February, 1898. He still refused to make the call or to make the request of Congress to engage in war. Our people everywhere were inflamed with the spirit of human justice.

Mark you, when the call did come, it was the result not of an insistence of Congress but the insistence of the people of the country. That is one war which was caused by the demand of the people themselves and not by the Chief Executive or by the Congress of the United States. War was declared in 1898. Senators think that is ancient history, I know, and they wonder why I speak of it. I am trying briefly to outline the understandings, the experiences, of the men for whom I speak.

There was a call for men. They sprang from everywhere. Every vocation in life, every State in the Union responded—many, many more than were needed. They entered camps unprepared. They were taken to southern camps, where many men died absolutely the result of neglect. I want Senators to know that in the first year of the Spanish War more men died in the uniform than died the first year of the World War, with less than one-tenth the number of men in uniform. We had no medical service; we had no hospitals. We had not the necessities of military life. We were helplessly in a rut in national preparedness.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLEASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MEANS. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator will not fail to insert in his remarks at this time how many thousands of those men had typhoid fever, how many of them suffered in the hospitals of the South, and how many died in those institutions all because those men were glad to serve their country in spite of the fact that the country was so unprepared. It seems to me it would further emphasize the position the Senator has taken.

Mr. MEANS. I thank the Senator from New York, but I do not want to delay nor make this effort of mine a lengthy one. So much I have and want to say that I do not care to indulge in a long recital. I am speaking generally of that unpreparedness, hoping that when the matter comes up, as it must come before this body, those figures will be available to the Committee on Military Affairs as well as to the Senate as a whole.

But it is true that those men were eager and anxious to serve their country. We were all headed for the southern camps when the startling victory of Dewey caused some of us to be sent to the far-away isles of the Philippines. My memory recalls how they were loaded upon transports, the only uniform being the heavy uniform of the mountain country, going to the tropics; how they were fed desiccated potatoes and fat hog meat. Those liners were coastwise liners and had never seen the deep blue. They were not fitted for transports.

After going overseas we were landed in a peanut field, mud 5 or 6 inches deep, and rain almost every hour of the day. We were without medicine. The doctors could carry in one pocket all the medicine they had for the use of that Army. I remember about all they had were C. C. pills and iodine. If a man had an ingrowing toenail they gave him one or the other and sometimes both. The doctors were greatly handicapped. They gave to us the best they had. They themselves were patriotic, but were sorely unprepared.

We had artillery. How did they get the artillery to the front? By means of horses or by motor trucks? Oh, no. By means of human power we dragged them through the mud and placed them in the trenches. I call attention to the fact that they had those old Long-Tom Springfields, weighing about 12 pounds and shooting black powder. After the fall of Manila, when we engaged the Filipinos, we found half-naked savages better equipped than were the American forces. They had Mausers with smokeless powder, carrying up to 1,000, 1,200, and 1,400 yards, while the American forces were equipped with Springfields, which would hardly carry up to 500 yards. As the boys used to say, they had to run them down to get close enough to shoot them.

I call your attention to the fact that before the attack upon Manila, when the commanders of units returned to their camps after a night and day in the trenches, they were complimented only as to the amount of ammunition they had used. There was not enough ammunition for one small battle, although the American forces were 10,000 miles across the sea, representing this rich Nation, which was absolutely unprepared for this emergency.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. MEANS. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. I dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I want him to touch upon all of the barriers to American success. I hope he will not forget the American soldiers, who were worse off than the ones he mentioned because they were fed on embalmed beef sent them by the War Department. The Senator will not forget that, I am sure.

Mr. MEANS. I wish that I might be gifted with oratorical ability that I could properly paint a picture of the sufferings of the men of that day solely because of a lack of preparedness. The eatables, as suggested by the Senator from New York—and I hate to refer to that scandal—were composed largely of embalmed beef, which afterwards it was determined was unfit for any human being to eat. But I want to hurry on, if the Senator will permit me, because I want to come down to the needs of the present hour.

While I am on the subject, I wish also to call attention to the fact that each and every one of those men who had volunteered for love of country to go anywhere, to do anything, after entering Manila kept marauders out, and, to the glory of American arms, let it be said, not a house was entered illegally, not a store looted, although the city was reputed to be rich in loot. Never before in all the history of the world has an attacking army upon a foreign city been denied the privilege of taking what it wanted, but when that force entered Manila not a house was disturbed, not a store looted, not a woman insulted. The marts of trade were open the following day under better protection than had ever been accorded before in all the history of the islands. They took cruelty, savagery, out of war and placed war upon a plane of humanitarian necessity.

I might picture at length the unpreparedness of that time, but I must hurry on. We came home soon thereafter and there sprang up in this country several veterans' organizations. In 1904, however, they all united for the common purpose of comradeship; but they had been so thoroughly imbued with the necessity of national defense that in 1904 they wrote into their constitution a declaration which is to-day the basis of our national defense act.

The experiences which those men gained at that time made it possible for us to have the national defense act which is on the statute books to-day. I wish to read what they recited in 1904 as to the necessity of providing an adequate national defense. Among the objects of the United Spanish War veterans as set forth in their constitution are:

To encourage and promote the maintenance of an adequate Military and Naval Establishment in our country and an efficient military and naval force in the several States, with a proper system for organizing a volunteer army in time of war; to educate our people to a sense of the necessity for making provision for national defense and to the importance of educating and training the youth of our land, so that they may be able sufficiently to serve their country and defend the flag in time of war.

That was the first public utterance in behalf of a national defense act. Do Senators realize that through the efforts of the men who served in 1898 there was created the national defense act of 1916? They recite in their declaration the obligation of every citizen to be a part of the national defense, and it is provided in the national defense act that every man over the age of 18 years and under the age of 45 years who is a citizen of this country or has declared his intention to be such shall be a part of the military force of the United States. Three different departments of national defense were provided. The first was the Regular Army, which had specific duties to perform. It was to garrison our overseas possessions and should be sufficient for that purpose; secondly, its duty was to educate the civilians of this country in the rudiments of military life; and third, it was to be such a force as could be used as then constituted in a minor emergency or that could be expanded for use in a major emergency in case of that great necessity.

It was provided then that the Regular Army should consist of 175,000 enlisted men. The act also provided for target practice; it provided for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, so that each student in college who desired might have proper military training. It provided for citizens' military training camps. It also provided for a reserve corps of officers, consisting of men who were informed as to military life and might be attached to the service in time of a great emergency. It provided for and looked forward to the time when the Regular Army would cease to be merely a unit of offense or defense but should be the instructor of the youth of the Nation.

The demand of our organization was that the youth of the country be educated in the fundamentals of camp life, sanitation,

the use of the rifle, and the necessity of being adequately prepared physically so as to withstand the hardships of the field.

The World War came; and I wish Senators to realize that had it not been for the Spanish War Veterans and their insistence upon national defense we should have had no leaders in the World War. I call attention to the fact that the commanding general of the American Expeditionary Forces, the chief of staff in this country, every army commander, all corps commanders, the commander of every division, and almost every brigade commander, was a Spanish-American War veteran.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 61 per cent of the field officers of the great Army representing this country in the World War saw service in the Spanish-American War. In addition to that, very many of the enlisted men, as well as junior officers, who were the fighting men in 1898 became the leaders in the war of 1917.

But for the experiences of that time and but for the knowledge gained by those officers and men and by the insistence upon adequate national defense we would not have been able to enter the World War as well prepared as we were. But even then I wish Senators to know that men entered the line overseas when they knew not how to handle the lock or magazine; yea, they knew not how to shoot a rifle; and yet they were placed in the front line through the necessities of the occasion as an absolute result of the then inadequate preparedness of this country.

Why are we talking about it at this hour, when the war is over?

Let me digress for a moment to say that General Pershing deserves far more credit in this country than he has received. His force, the greatness of his brain, the driving ability of the man, met a great emergency. Well do I remember being in the city of Washington in 1908, when we were first preparing for the national defense. The then chief of staff, Gen. J. Franklin Bell, was making out his confidential report on all the generals of the Army. I was permitted to see the remarks added to the efficiency card of General Pershing, which were written by General Bell at that time:

If the United States Army is ever called upon to do great things, General Pershing is the man to do them.

That prophecy has been fulfilled. Perhaps the President of the United States also had acquainted himself with that little confidential reference which made it possible for him to select the man he did to command the forces of the American Expeditionary Forces.

After the conclusion of the war it was General Pershing who insisted upon a board being appointed to study the situation with a view to providing an adequate national defense. There grew out of that action the national defense act of 1920, to which we now refer as the first declaration of a military policy in this country. That, however, is not true, for the first declaration was the national defense act of 1916. The two were very similar, but the latter act divided the Nation into nine corps areas. The purpose was to have one Regular Army division in each corps area; to have in each area two divisions of the National Guard available in the event of a great emergency, and three divisions of the Reserve Corps.

The divisions of the Regular Army would be responsible for the education of the civilian force within the respective areas. They would also be responsible in case an expansion of the military forces became necessary for the civilian forces and the volunteer Reserve Corps, making those forces with the Regular Army one component part of the great Army necessary to be called in time of emergency. That plan was thought well of, and Congress passed the bill without serious objection. That bill was passed, mark you, in 1920, when the horrors that resulted from inefficiency and inadequate preparedness were fresh in our memories. We were willing to act upon the judgment of men who had seen service in the Army.

We provided in the last national defense act for an enlisted strength of the Regular Army of 280,000. We provided for a National Guard strength of over 400,000. We provided for a Reserve Corps the strength of which it is impossible to state in figures because that corps took in all the man power of the Nation and made it available for use in the national defense.

Up to this moment I have referred exclusively to the Army, but I will refer to the other branch of the national defense as soon as I have completed the reference to the Army, which is usually named first when we speak of the national defense.

I now call your attention, Mr. President, to the present situation in which we find ourselves, which is the reason why I am forced at this time to address myself to this question. We have the plea of economy in this country. It has gripped the imagination of the American people and properly so. We

elected to the highest office within the gift of the United States a man who has served at the right hour and who by his very life and by his preachments caused the people of this country to stop, look, and listen in their wild orgy of governmental expenditures. It was he who by his very presence, his life, his habits, yea, his expressions, caused us to stop and think. Economy was an attractive slogan to the American people and properly so. Economy should be practiced in every department of the Government. It is a practice I do not quarrel with, except when under the specious plea of economy the national defense of this country is threatened; and then I say it is false economy.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are drifting away from the great act of 1920. In that act, as I have said, we provided first for a Regular Army of 280,000 men. On June 30, 1921, the following year, we had a Regular Army of 206,274 men, but at that time there was a joint resolution passed by the Congress, yea, over the veto of the then President, which reduced the standing Army to 175,000. The Army, looking to that reduction, which they saw coming, then stopped all recruiting, until when June 30, 1922, came, at which time the figures are usually made up, we found that the number of men in the Regular Army had dropped to 125,160. On June 30, 1923, the number had dropped to 111,337. The question may be asked why that falling off in number? It was due to the fact that Congress fixed the maximum figure of 125,000, and that figure can not be arrived at exactly by those in charge of recruiting for the Army.

The trouble, I find, is that Congress insists on fixing the maximum figures instead of minimum figures as to what the forces of the United States shall be.

On June 30, 1925, we had 115,130, and on June 30 of last year we had 112,878. Only last year we passed an act providing for an increase in the aircraft personnel. We thought it was a five-year program. We believed that this was an addition to the force that we now have. We provided, I believe, for an increase of 1,284 each year, and an increase in the officer personnel, and an increase in the instruction to be given to the Reserve Air Corps officers. Now, however, when the interpretation comes out, it is not the interpretation of those of us who voted for the bill, but the entire Army must take up that increase; and it results that 5,000 more must be taken from the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army to meet the requirements of the bill we passed last year.

I want to refer, as I hurry along, to that portion of the national defense act which is particularly appealing to the veterans of this land, and that is the training of the civilian—the training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as it is called. We find that the colleges everywhere have been taking on more and more units, voluntarily teaching the young men of the country how to become leaders. We fill up the Reserve Corps with the new blood coming from the colleges, the ideal men for young officers, and it is a thing we must have if we are to have a military policy at all; but what do I find? I find that we have gradually increased since 1920 until in 1926 we had 120,070 enrolled in our Reserve Officers' Training Corps; but the estimate now before the committee cuts down that number until all we are entitled to have is 116,000.

That is the step that caused me to speak that we might stop this reduction now. We are reducing the education of the civilian in this country because of the lack of appropriations. This is the first step, and it is a step backward.

Also I call your attention to the estimate in regard to the citizens' military training camps. When it was determined that this was our policy, well do I remember the remarks of President Harding, who said he hoped there would be 100,000 young men in this country who would take advantage of the military training camps; and the exact words of President Coolidge are—

I hope that each year an increasing number of young men may take advantage of the opportunity which is afforded them.

What has been the result? In 1921 we had only 10,000 young men coming to camp, receiving a benefit the like of which they could receive in no other place in all the world. No school, no other education, is equal to the education the young man receives in these military training camps. Gradually it has increased, until in 1926 we had 34,194; and now, by the estimates of the department—which are called for because of the lack of appropriation, because we are becoming niggardly upon this subject—the number is reduced until we can have in this year only 31,000. It is the step backward that we object to, the limiting under the specious plea of economy of the carrying out of the spirit of the national defense act of 1920—yea, of 1916. It means more than is realized by those who prefer to think about it in terms of "Oh, well, never mind! We cut

it last year, and nothing happened; and we will cut it next year, and nothing will happen. The world will go on just the same, and the country is just as safe"; and soon we will have the condition that existed at the time when the people demanded that young men enter the service in 1898. We will have a willingness of Americans to respond to the call of their country, but an absolute unpreparedness to do so effectively.

Let me call your attention to this fact:

The basis of military activity, of the efficiency of the American Army, lies in the use of the rifle by the doughboy. Oh, yes; we need the airplane; we need the scouts; we need the artillery; we need all of the other branches. They are absolutely necessary; but the efficiency of the American Army has been great because the individual doughboy had the rifle in his hand and knew how to use it. Well do I recall that when General Pershing was overseas; he examined very carefully all the trench warfare, all the new arms, all the new necessities; and then, out of the wisdom of the great man that he is, he sent back word to those who were training soldiers in this country: "Put men on the target range! The old American idea of the soldier with the gun, and his ability to use it, will win this war!" We immediately quit the foolishness of spending all our time upon trench warfare, and went back to the fundamental American idea of military effectiveness.

Now, what do I find? We have for many, many years granted to the enlisted man who became proficient in the use of the rifle a marksmanship medal, and there goes with that the privilege of receiving \$2 a month more for his pay. Because of a Budget Director who claims that we must economize, the Army is forced to take away from that man his \$2 a month, and he gets nothing additional. You are injuriously affecting the morale of the very men who are to teach our great and splendid Army if an emergency ever requires that we have one.

The specious plea of economy is bringing the Army to a desperate position, which the men I represent are willing to fight against, and to throw the entire influence of their organization on the side of demanding adequate preparedness, demanding that the spirit and the intent of the national defense act be carried out.

Those who have served know that the first sergeant is the very backbone of any company. He, more than anybody else, is responsible for the morale, responsible for the discipline, responsible for the efficiency of any unit. Why, because the first sergeant receives an advanced pay, there are companies in our Army now which are doing without that noncommissioned officer in order to save that expense and letting some company clerk attempt to fulfill his duties, merely because they are forced to save. In places you will find regiments doing without one company, doing everything they can to meet the requirements of the economy program, yet attempting to carry out the spirit of the national defense act.

I want you to know this on the question of target practice: We are now stopped from using the target range to its greatest efficiency because it is said that we are using up too much ammunition. It is not for me to quote the figures, but they are available to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. We are to-day far behind in our storage of ammunition. If called on to-morrow, we would be without sufficient ammunition, just as we were in 1898, and because of the lack of ammunition to-day, because of this policy of false economy, we are denied the right of sufficient target practice in the United States Army.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEANS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Was that appropriation cut out of the bill?

Mr. MEANS. No; if I may say so, it was not; but the Budget Director, when estimates are made, just deliberately cuts them down. He says: "This is all you are going to have." The Army is forced to keep up the spirit and intent of the national defense act, and the authorities must whittle where they can, and they have been forced to whittle down until we meet the present condition.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him whether the Congress of the United States has delegated all of its authority to the Budget Director? Are we no longer to have any say about what sort of an Army or Navy or Government we shall have?

Mr. MEANS. I am going to refer to that in a moment. If the Senator please, I am coming to that very point.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. MEANS. I want you to know some of the results of this attempt to save and to meet the requirements of the economy program. This summer I visited Fort Riley, Kans. Officers going to school there are stationed at that fort with their wives and their children. I went into the quarters that

they are required to occupy; and I want you to know that there is not a section foreman in the United States to-day but that is better housed than the officers going to school at Fort Riley. I want you to know that Fort Benning, Fort Bragg, and others are far worse than that.

At Fort Leavenworth we have the great school, founded by General Bell, which teaches officers the line of duty, the requirements for field maneuvers. It is true that we have the War College here, but that is technical in the extreme. The most important school in all the country is located at Fort Leavenworth. Every officer should be permitted to go through that school. What have we done? This estimate now submitted for our consideration cuts in half the number of officers that we have been educating during the past few years; and, if it keeps up, some of the officers will never receive the benefit of the schooling at Fort Leavenworth.

This question of the morale of the Army may not be interesting. Some will say: "Oh, he is just one of those who believe in militarism."

Mr. President, no one knows the horror of war like the men who served, unless it be the mothers who had to remain at home and suffer in silence. We do not want war. We want peace. We have no idea of ever again entering war. If it were the privilege of the service men of this country to determine the question, there would be no war. All things would be settled by arbitration. But if the time comes when the public become inflamed over a matter of injustice, a matter of defense, and the young men are called out, we say those young men are entitled to know at least the fundamentals of warfare, and to be so prepared that they can use a rifle in case of emergency. It is a declaration of policy which is fundamental to America; and the service men to-day, seeing the attempt to cut the preparedness of the United States both as to Navy and as to Army, are demanding that the spirit and intent of the national defense act of 1920 be carried out. That is their insistence and their demand.

As to the National Guard, under the national defense act we provided for 435,000 members of the National Guard. Immediately after a general allocation of units for a five-year program under which it would take a certain length of time for them to build up the units, it was found expedient to cut the appropriation, and by an amendment to the act of 1920 the National Guard was to consist of 250,000 members. Nobody felt then that it would ever go below that number.

The very backbone, the very first line when the time comes for offense or defense, will be the efficiency of the National Guard of this country; and now what do I find under this proposed appropriation? We find that the strength available under the proposed appropriation is 185,000. We are deliberately cutting down, whittling away at the national defense, contrary to the spirit and intent of the national defense act; and it is of those things that we complain.

We provided also for the organized reserve officers. There was an attempt to get all of the officers who served in the World War, who were efficient, who had the ability, who had the willingness, to enter the Officers' Reserve Corps, and we provided for their instruction. We provided that schools should be available to them for 15 days of each year, so that they would keep alive to the changes of the times, that they should be informed, yea, that they would not forget the experiences of the years past, and that they would be available as leaders at all times.

We thought that was a wonderful plan. Schools were prepared, and the men responded, left their work, left their ordinary vocations of life to go to school to educate themselves to be proficient leaders in a time of emergency. We started in with 187 student officers. In 1923 there were 4,000 officers enrolled, in 1924 there were 7,000, and in 1925, 1926 and 1927 we struck the average that we hoped to maintain, being about 17,000 Reserve Corps officers attending schools.

Now, I find that the estimate in the proposed Budget has been cut down so that we will have only 14,000. What does that mean? It means that noncombatant officers, which embrace about 40 per cent of all the Reserve Corps officers, will never receive training. They will simply go along with their commissions and have nothing in the way of training, while those who command combatant units will receive training only once in every four or five years.

Is that training?

Is that helping to create leadership?

No. Instead of carrying out the spirit and intent of the national defense act, the action of the Budget Director will absolutely cut it down, and I say it is false economy.

Upon every item the Army is called upon to reduce, to save. Economy is necessary, as I said before, but I do not want the hour to come when we will be called upon to respond to the

plea of the American people for any call to arms, and find that the young men of America are permitted to sacrifice themselves upon the altar of unpreparedness.

You and I, as citizens of this country, owe it to the memory of the men who served in 1898 and those who served in 1918 to give to the Army and to the military forces in general that which we deemed necessary in 1920. We drew a great picture. We had a great plan. We had a proposal which was ideal. We were going to have one division in every corps area, but what happened? We now have in one a division complete, we have in two others divisions which are incomplete, and in most others we have a brigade, but not in all of them. In other words, the forces have been cut down until we are unable to carry out the spirit of the national defense act of 1920.

These conclusions, Mr. President, are the result of my own observation. They come also from the records of The Adjutant General's office, from the Chief of Staff, and from the actions of the Budget Director and the estimates made in accordance with the demands of the director.

We must act if we are to avert this constant reduction, this plea, "Well, we must save, and we will save right here. We intend to make it up in some other year, but we are going to save this year. We cut the appropriation for the Army down and nothing happened; it is all right, and we will just cut again."

The hour will come when something will happen, and then we will be sorry and we will regret it. We will pay out millions and billions of money in idle, wasteful expenditures, trying to place the country in a position of preparedness, but too late. The lives of your young men will have been sacrificed because of the forgetfulness of the legislators of this country and the people at large.

This is a matter essential to our safety, and we should stop now and declare that we will not again fix a maximum in the Army, in the National Guard, and in the Reserve Corps, but that we will fix a minimum, so that the appropriation will be sufficient.

I do not like to recite the weaknesses of the Army. I know that officers are working harder to-day than ever before; willingly, vigilantly, uncomplainingly. They are taking on their dual occupation. Before the act of 1920 they were merely required to prepare themselves for any emergency; but to-day they are teachers; to-day they are men who are sent out among the civilians of the country, teaching them the necessary, rudimentary principles of a military life, and all about sanitation and discipline. An officer nowadays who can not impart his knowledge to the youth of America ceases to be efficient, and is soon dropped from the rolls of the Army. The Army itself is now responsible for the teaching of the civilians.

I want the Senate and the country to know, Mr. President, that the service men of America are declaring now—yea, we are pleading, we are demanding—that the spirit of the act of 1920 be carried out, and that this reduction, this niggardly policy of economy must not cause a reduction in the component units provided for by the act of 1920. Such reductions will inevitably break it down, and we will fall again into unpreparedness.

I know that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs will shortly address the Senate at some length, and will give the Senate figures as to the condition of the United States Navy. The great forces of this country are divided into the naval forces and the Army. As to the Navy, it is said that we should observe the agreements for disarmament. That is true. We would be glad if we should never have to go to war. We would be glad if peace should come, when we could do away with all war. But do Senators realize that to-day, whether we wish it or not, we have the leadership of the world in finances and in commercial activities. There comes with that leadership admiration, it is true, but also jealousy, envy, and hatred, and any American who says that we should not be sufficiently prepared to meet a great emergency is derelict in his duty of citizenship.

Yea, I say to you, we do not want great armaments; we do not care for a race to build greater battleships. No; we would like to be able to do away with them all, but we also know that it is absolutely essential that this country have a Navy equal to that of any other country in the world. We can not afford to be surpassed by any other country, and when figures are brought to us which indicate a policy of reduction to the extent that we trail behind any other nation, I say that is false economy, that is tearing down the great wall of national protection and national preparedness.

Oh, it is a big subject; it would take me many hours to recite the facts and details, such as suggested by the learned Senator from New York, and I do want now to place before the Senate of the United States and the Congress as a whole

and the American public the demand of the service men who served their country in 1898, in the war with Spain, and the campaigns incident thereto—for I am privileged to be their voice. I also believe that all the service men of this country are demanding to-day that we have a Navy equal to that of any other nation, unsurpassed by that of any other nation in all the world, and that we have adequate preparedness; that the national defense act of 1920 be carried out in its spirit and in its intent; and that no policy of economy shall interfere.

The American people, I believe, demand that; demand that our preparedness be not crippled, and that there be not taken gradually from the military and the naval life of this Nation the force that makes it efficient and necessary to the protection of all the citizens of this country.

I apologize for taking this hour of the Senate's time, but I did want to make it clear to the Senate, to the Congress, and to the people at large that the service men of America are demanding that the act of 1920 be carried out. We demand that the naval forces of this country shall equal those of any other country in all the world.

MATERNITY AND INFANT HYGIENE

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7555) to authorize for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1928, and June 30, 1929, appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1921.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bayard	Edwards	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Mo.
Bingham	Ferris	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.
Blease	Fess	Lenroot	Robinson, Ind.
Borah	Fletcher	McKellar	Sheppard
Bratton	Frazier	McMaster	Stock
Broussard	Gillett	McNary	Stephens
Bruce	Glass	Mayfield	Swanson
Cameron	Hale	Means	Wadsworth
Capper	Harris	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Harrison	Norris	Warren
Copeland	Hawes	Nye	Weller
Curtis	Heflin	Oddie	Wheeler
Dale	Howell	Overman	Willis
Dill	Johnson	Philips	
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. STEWART] are detained in a committee meeting.

I also wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are detained in the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. SACKETT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. TYSON] are detained in the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the then occupant of the chair stated at 2 o'clock that he laid before the Senate the unfinished business, referring to the maternity bill, Senate bill 7555. I desire to raise the point that that bill is not properly before the Senate. So far as the particular bill is concerned it is an immaterial matter with me, but I think it is important that the question shall be settled right.

The history of the matter is this: A motion was made in the morning hour to take up the bill, but at 2 o'clock the bill was displaced by the unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate at that hour would go into executive session for the purpose of considering a particular matter, namely, the Lausanne treaty. The effect of the unanimous-consent agreement was that the Senate while in legislative session had agreed that at the termination of the morning hour it would take up for consideration a particular matter. It is true that it was a matter executive in its nature.

I am aware of the precedents which hold that if a particular bill is taken up in the morning hour and then is debated beyond the morning hour, it remains the unfinished

business until otherwise displaced. But where there has been a unanimous-consent agreement made in legislative session that at the end of the morning hour an executive session shall be held for the purpose of considering a particular matter, that action of the Senate ends the discussion of the bill which was taken up during the morning hour, and when again taken up it must be by motion. That, in my judgment, is the fair construction of the rule.

There is a decision by Vice President Marshall which I think may be relied upon by those who contend otherwise than I have just contended, found in Giffry's Precedents, volume 2, page 102, but in my judgment it sustains the contention which I now make instead of sustaining the opposite contention. I will read it for the information of the Chair.

Senate bill 6060, known as the immigration bill, was taken up for consideration in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. REED.—

I made the inquiry myself, it appears—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to inquire as to the parliamentary situation. Is this bill now before the Senate by unanimous consent or on a vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT (Mr. MARSHALL). On a vote.

Mr. REED. The time for its consideration, then, will expire at 2 o'clock for to-day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no unfinished business.

Mr. REED. How could it be made the unfinished business during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been, yet.

Mr. REED. Oh, I understand the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is simply being taken up by the Senate on motion, as the rules provide, and being considered.

Mr. REED. It may be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is taken up.

Mr. REED. Taken up now, during the morning hour; but its right of way will expire, as I understand the Chair, at 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no unfinished business. If there were unfinished business it would expire then. There being no unfinished business, it will proceed until displaced by something else. (See Cong. Record, p. 46.)

If there were any unfinished business the bill would expire at 2 o'clock, because the unfinished business would then intervene and take the time of the Senate. In the present case there was unfinished business, not legislative, but by the action of the Senate in legislative session we took up a specific matter in executive session, so that the legislative day ended at 2 o'clock and nothing else could be taken up thereafter.

It appears to me that that presents the situation. If we treat the precedents logically and have regard for the action of the Senate, it seems to me that the right of way of the maternity bill ended when the unanimous consent intervened. I submit these observations to the Vice President, the presiding officer of the Senate, for his ruling.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I do not care to take time to discuss the matter unless the Chair desires it. It is so clear to me under this precedent and under all reasoning that the pending bill is the unfinished business that it hardly seems open to argument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has given some thought to the matter and is prepared to rule upon it. However, in the mind of the Chair the question is not quite so clear as the Senator from Wisconsin would indicate.

Mr. LENROOT. If that is the case, I would like to discuss it very briefly.

Before I go to the precedents may I say that the unfinished business arises from the rules themselves. Unfinished business is created solely through the Senate having, at the time of adjournment, business before it that is not completed. That is what makes it the unfinished business.

Now, so far as the hour of 2 o'clock is concerned, it has no importance and no relevance except in such cases where there is some matter having a higher privilege when that hour arrives; that is, "2 o'clock." So that if there be any unfinished business at 2 o'clock, any matter taken up before that hour must give way to the unfinished business, which is of a higher privilege. But if there be no unfinished business, 2 o'clock is not of the slightest importance. The Chair would not look at the clock to ascertain when 2 o'clock arrived if there were no unfinished business, because there is no action of any kind required or possible from the Chair if there be no unfinished business prior to that time.

I think it will be conceded that if the Senate had gone on past the hour of 2 o'clock the Chair would not have called the attention of the Senate to the fact that the hour of 2 o'clock

had arrived. The bill would have gone on right past the hour and it is conceded that if it had gone five minutes past the hour it would have become the unfinished business.

The Senator from Missouri spoke about going into executive session. Surely the fact of our going into executive session could not have any greater relevancy to this question than if the Senate had adjourned promptly at the hour of 2 o'clock. Suppose when this matter came up that, instead of going into executive session, the Senate had adjourned at precisely the hour of 2 o'clock. Would not the bill have then been the unfinished business? Of course, it would. Could the fact that the Senate had agreed to go into executive session be of any greater weight in displacing the bill than if the Senate had actually adjourned at the hour of 2 o'clock?

Let me suppose again that after having remained in executive session the other day for two hours we would have returned to legislative session; what would have been the question before the Senate? It would have been this bill. If we had continued its consideration until adjournment, then the Senator from Missouri concedes that it would have been the unfinished business. We did not do that, but the legislative business that was pending at the time the Senate went into executive session was this bill. We remained in executive session until adjournment. When the Senate again met in legislative session it had not disposed of the bill which was then pending.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. This morning there was a motion made to take up a bridge bill. That motion was put and carried. Did not that action of the Senate set aside the unfinished business?

Mr. LENROOT. The unfinished business could not be laid before the Senate until the hour of 2 o'clock had arrived. If a motion had been made to take up the bridge bill after the hour of 2 o'clock and had carried that would have set aside the unfinished business, and what would be the unfinished business thereafter would depend upon what matter might be before the Senate at the time of adjournment to-night.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Will the Senator permit another inquiry?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator just argued that the hour of 2 o'clock played no part in the situation.

Mr. LENROOT. When there is no unfinished business.

Mr. BROUSSARD. When there is no unfinished business; but the morning hour is terminated whenever any legislative business is taken up by action of the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, no. Legislative business may be taken up during the morning hour.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It was taken up.

Mr. LENROOT. But it has no right of way after 2 o'clock if there be unfinished business. If there is no unfinished business, the bill under consideration goes right on regardless of the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. EDGE. Then the Senator from Wisconsin does not differentiate between a motion made to take up a measure before 2 o'clock and a motion made to take up business after 2 o'clock? He considers it the unfinished business just the same?

Mr. LENROOT. If a motion should be made after the hour of 2 o'clock to take up another bill and that motion should prevail, this bill would then be displaced as the unfinished business; and what would become of the unfinished business would depend wholly upon what was before the Senate at the time of adjournment to-night.

Mr. EDGE. I thoroughly understand that; but in the case before us there was no unfinished business. Before the hour of 2 o'clock, the time set aside for the morning hour, a motion was made to take up this bill. At 2 o'clock, under a unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate went into executive session, so that the discussion of this bill was necessarily concluded at 2 o'clock.

Mr. LENROOT. For that day.

Mr. EDGE. It has never been in the position of unfinished business, as I understand the term "unfinished business."

Mr. LENROOT. No bill can ever get into the position of being unfinished business until there has been an adjournment. May I say to the Senator that if the legislative session of the Senate had run until half-past 2 o'clock on that day that would have made this bill the unfinished business.

Mr. EDGE. It is my understanding that a motion must be made after 2 o'clock to make a bill the unfinished business.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to answer the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] before yielding.

Mr. WILLIS. Very well.

Mr. LENROOT. May I say to the Senator that a bill can not ever become the unfinished business by motion to make it such. It is true there is one precedent to that effect, but it never has been followed, because it is against all reason. Unfinished business arises by operation of the rule; that is, no motion is in order to make a bill the unfinished business; but a motion is in order to take up a bill, and if the consideration of that bill has not been concluded at the time of adjournment on that day and it remains under discussion at that hour, it automatically becomes the unfinished business.

Mr. EDGE. In this particular case the consideration of the bill could not proceed beyond 2 o'clock.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; on that particular day.

Mr. EDGE. Therefore, while it is technically unfinished, it is true; yet in order that it should become the recognized unfinished business, a specific motion to take it up running after 2 o'clock is necessary.

Mr. LENROOT. No bill could become the unfinished business on that day; that was impossible under the rule.

Mr. EDGE. That is just the contention I make.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like at this point to read and comment upon the precedent cited by the Senator from Missouri. The immigration bill was taken up for consideration and the Senator from Missouri himself propounded the inquiry:

I desire to inquire as to the parliamentary situation. Is this bill now before the Senate by unanimous consent or on a vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT (Mr. Marshall). On a vote.

Mr. REED. The time for its consideration, then, will expire at 2 o'clock for to-day.

That is exactly the contention that the Senator now makes in this case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no unfinished business.

Mr. REED. How could it be made the unfinished business during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been yet.

Of course, he was correct in that.

Mr. REED. Oh, I understand the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is simply being taken up by the Senate on motion, as the rules provide, and being considered.

Mr. REED. It may be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is taken up.

Mr. REED. Taken up now, during the morning hour; but its right of way will expire, as I understand the Chair, at 2 o'clock?

Here is the crucial point—

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no unfinished business. If there were unfinished business it would expire then. There being no unfinished business, it will proceed until displaced by something else.

The Chair did not state that it could not be made the unfinished business.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, what I want to suggest to the Senator is this, which seems to me to go directly to the point made by the Senator from Missouri: So far as the legislative program is concerned, it is resumed just the same as if there had been no executive business; in other words, the executive business can not interpose or interfere with the legislative program to make any measure lose its position.

Mr. LENROOT. Absolutely not.

Mr. WILLIS. The contention made by the Senator from Missouri, as I understand it, is that, in effect, this executive business became the unfinished legislative business. Of course, as the Senator has explained, that can not be, and therefore the unfinished business in this case was the bill to which the Senator referred, and in the pending case, of course, is the maternity bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, it is very difficult to get two gentlemen on the same side of a question to disagree, but I want to get the view of the Senator from Wisconsin. Suppose that the Senate had gone into ordinary legislative session and that after this bill had been brought up and discussed in the morning hour for 15 minutes we had adjourned until the next day, would this bill then have been the unfinished business on the next day?

Mr. LENROOT. Absolutely; there can be no question about that if brought up under such a motion as was made when this bill was brought up. Of course, a bill might be brought up under Rule VIII, an unobjected bill, where that would not apply.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Let us see where that would take us. If, then, the next morning when we convened another

matter was brought up for consideration during the morning hour and remained before the Senate and was debated until 2 o'clock, which bill would have the precedence after 2 o'clock, the one then actually before the Senate or the one that was discussed on the day before? Bill No. 1 is before the session during the morning hour, and before the morning hour expired the Senate adjourned. The next day a new morning hour intervenes, and bill No. 2 is brought up for consideration and is debated until 2 o'clock. I say that it remains the unfinished business and not the bill that was partially considered for a few minutes on the day before.

Mr. LENROOT. Upon what theory does the Senator say that?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I say that, in my judgment, would be the necessary ruling, and that when a bill is up for consideration during the morning hour, and the Senate adjourns when a new day dawns, we start all over again. The only way a measure can become the unfinished business and remain such from day to day is to have its consideration proceed beyond the morning hour; and if it does proceed beyond the morning hour it then becomes the unfinished business.

I say that when the Senate agrees to go into executive session at 2 o'clock, if the business of the executive session is not regarded as legislative in the sense that it forms a bar to the business of the morning session continuing, at least it is tantamount to an adjournment. One or the other is true. No precedent, in my judgment, can be found here to support the contention that a bill which is considered during the morning hour, and is not disposed of during the morning hour, the Senate adjourning before the morning hour is over, or immediately at the end of the morning hour so that the bill does not run into the regular afternoon session, will have precedence over another bill that is brought up the next morning and remains undisposed of when the morning hour has expired.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the Senator explain what, in his judgment, is the reason for the difference in treatment of bills which do and do not die at 2 o'clock?

In other words, the Senator realizes that there may be two bills of apparently equal importance and equal interest. One of them comes up before 2 o'clock and is debated, but the debate is not concluded by 2 o'clock and something else takes its place at 2 o'clock. All consideration of that bill then passes from the scene, and it goes back to its place on the calendar; whereas, had it been up at 2 o'clock on a preceding day and become the unfinished business, it would have been in a very different status.

What is the theory, in other words, on which bills in the morning hour, if they can go through quickly, may go through, and if they do not go through at that time they can not go through? Is it not that we make two distinct classes of bills?

Mr. LENROOT. The theory is very, very simple indeed. The theory is that when the Senate takes up a bill for consideration it shall not have several uncompleted bills before it, but that the bill that the Senate has been considering on a previous day shall have priority over a bill taken up during the morning hour; and, therefore, the bill that is called up during the morning hour must give way to the bill that the Senate has been considering upon a previous day. That is the theory of it. It is a very sensible theory and a very proper one.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is it not also the theory that the Senate should attempt to get through as much business as possible before 2 o'clock?

Mr. LENROOT. We have what is known as the morning hour under Rule VIII, so that the calendar may be called, unless the Senate shall specifically otherwise order; first, for the consideration of unobjected bills, as to which there is a five-minute rule; and, secondly, if the calendar be completed under that call, then we may proceed to the consideration of bills under Rule IX during the morning hour. It is true that we do give that morning hour for the consideration of bills to which the Senate has not given the major portion of its time; but when there is a bill that the Senate has had under consideration, it is given the right of way after 2 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to suggest that the theory now advanced by the Senator from Connecticut and concurred in, as I understand, by the Senator from Missouri, would lead to a situation in which we would get no business completed at all?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. It would simply take us into a legislative quagmire.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no!

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why would we get no business completed?

Mr. WILLIS. Because the Senate would be working one day on one bill and another day on another bill, and finishing nothing; but the theory expounded accurately, I think, by the Senator from Wisconsin, would lead us to the position where, when we have taken up a bill and it has become the unfinished business, we would finish that bill. The Senator, however, would have us go off after some other bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. It happens every day here that we have a bill up in the morning hour. We debate it a while. The hour of 2 o'clock arrives, and we take up another bill; but we can always continue the discussion of the bill that is taken up during the morning hour by a motion made after 2 o'clock, unless, of course, some special order is made by unanimous consent.

Mr. LENROOT. It displaces the unfinished business if we do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Certainly it does; and always when we make a motion to take up a bill during the regular hours of the Senate, we displace anything that is on the calendar. That inevitably follows.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the difficulty with my friends' theory clearly is that they are attempting to read into the rule with reference to the relevancy of the hour of 2 o'clock something which has no place in the rule, and which has no place in any theory of parliamentary law. I repeat, the hour of 2 o'clock in this connection is important only and can have any relevancy only in case there be unfinished business at the hour of 2 o'clock; and I want to repeat that in this case the Chair would have paid no attention to the arrival of the hour of 2 o'clock. Neither the Chair nor the Senate would have taken any action with reference to this bill if it had gone over before the hour of 2 o'clock; and so, if the Senate had adjourned at 2 o'clock, then there would have been but one question: What was under consideration by the Senate in legislative session at the time of adjournment? This bill being under consideration at the time of adjournment, it automatically became the unfinished business, and it is properly before the Senate now.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator has a pleasant habit of just asserting that a thing is true, and that settles it. Of course, if what the Senator has stated is correct and his conclusions are correct there is not any doubt about this question, and never was. He opened his remarks by stating that there was no doubt about it. I am perfectly free to say that I think there is doubt about it. I am perfectly free to say that there may be arguments made on the other side; but I want to submit to the President of the Senate the thought that, regardless of any precedents which may exist in ordinary cases, when the Senate agrees in open legislative session that it will terminate the legislative session of a certain day at 2 o'clock and that at that hour it will proceed to the consideration of a particular measure, the fact that that is done behind closed doors, although it might be done in open session, does not alter the case. It is the same as though the Senate had proceeded with that business in open session, because they agreed in open session to take up that particular piece of business.

That appeals to me as a logical deduction. It may not be; but certainly we can not settle it by simply asserting that there is no doubt, and that "this is what the rule means" and "that is what the rule means," and "this is what happens" and "that is what happens," and "I say so," and "that is the end of it."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I have heard nobody question the correctness of the statement just made by the Senator from Missouri. I have stated that this matter should be considered exactly as if we had adjourned at 2 o'clock, which is going even further than the Senator goes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; it is not going further, in my judgment. I say that in open session we agreed to do a particular thing, to consider a particular question at a particular hour. That business which we then took up was exactly the same in effect under those circumstances as though we had proceeded with that business in open session, as though it had been legislative in its character.

Mr. LENROOT. Suppose we had; but if we had proceeded in open session it would not have affected this question. If we had proceeded in open executive session we still have two classes of unfinished business—executive and legislative—and it would not have made the slightest difference.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Not at all, in my judgment. I do not think the rule is sound at all that when legislative busi-

ness is considered that does not stop the lapsing over of a matter which begins in the morning hour. But, admitting that it is true, the difference here is that in open session we agreed that at the hour of 2 o'clock we would take up a particular matter as a Senate. It is true that we acted in our executive capacity.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does the fact that we agreed to go into executive session at 2 o'clock have any greater sanctity or effect than if at the hour of 2 o'clock some one had moved that we go into executive session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator will pardon the Chair, the Chair is informed that the order was made in executive session.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well; it is equally binding. It was a unanimous-consent agreement, as I understand.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The point I make is that the unanimous-consent agreement merely took the place of a motion which would have been made at the hour of 2 o'clock. If we had been proceeding with any business before the Senate, and the hour of 2 o'clock had arrived, and some one had moved that we then proceed to the consideration of executive business, does the Senator believe that that would have displaced the matter which was then before the Senate?

The mere fact that some one happened, at the hour of 2 o'clock, to make a motion to go into executive session would not have affected the business then pending before the Senate, and when we agreed at some time that at the hour of 2 o'clock we would go into executive session the agreement simply took the place of a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business. To my mind, the fact that there was a unanimous-consent agreement would not affect the parliamentary status at all. The legislative business which was proceeding at the time we went into executive session was proceeding to the end of that legislative session; and the fact that we went into executive session and later on adjourned as if in open legislative session, restored the status of the bill which was pending at the time we went into executive session.

Mr. REED of Missouri. What does the Senator say about this proposition? Going back to the illustration I used, suppose a bill is taken up in the morning hour. It is discussed a few moments. Before the morning hour expires the Senate adjourns. The next day we have a morning hour. A bill is taken up and is discussed until 2 o'clock. Does the Senator claim that that bill, which has been up for discussion that day and the discussion has gone along until 2 o'clock, is displaced by a bill that was called up during the morning hour of a previous day?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Not if it is merely called up.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Called up and laid before the Senate.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. But if it is taken up on motion, as this bill was—it was not taken up under Rule VIII; it was not taken up under the regular Consent Calendar provision of the rules.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am perfectly aware of that.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. But after the morning business was over a motion was made to take up this bill. It was taken up, and it proceeded. If the Senate had adjourned at half past 12 or half past 1 or 1 or half past 2, that would have been the business which was before the Senate in that legislative session, and it has never been displaced by anything in legislative session. Therefore it is the unfinished business, the Senate in the meantime having adjourned.

So let us take the illustration which the Senator from Missouri puts forward. We do take up a bill by motion, and we proceed until 1 o'clock, and we then adjourn. The next day we take up the morning business, of course, and the rules apply during the morning hour; but when 2 o'clock arrives the business which was proceeding at the time the Senate adjourned on the previous day becomes the unfinished business of the succeeding day.

Mr. REED of Missouri. All right. Let us carry our illustration one step further. On the second day we have a bill that is not disposed of. It runs up until 2 o'clock. Then the bill of the previous day takes its place.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It does.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Then the next day comes along, and we have a morning hour, and another bill is called up. The first bill has been disposed of. Is the bill that remains unfinished on the second day to come in?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. No.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why not?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Here is just exactly what occurs: On the second day, the hour of 2 o'clock having ar-

rived, the unfinished business of the first day takes its place before the Senate. That bill, taken up on the second day, and which was displaced by the unfinished business at the hour of 2 o'clock, goes back to the calendar under the rule.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Where is the rule for that?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is generally understood.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I would like to see the rule which provides that.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is a thing that is enforced every time the Senate is in session and has a bill up under the unanimous-consent rule, the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, and we have unfinished business. When there is unfinished business, at the hour of 2 o'clock that must be laid before the Senate, and that will displace anything that is before the Senate at that time, which would then go to the calendar. On the first day to which the Senator referred, there was no unfinished business to force the measure being considered by the Senate back to the calendar. It was the business before the Senate when the agreement for an executive session went into effect. We considered the executive business for some time during the afternoon, but we did not even adjourn until we went back into legislative session, and when we went back into legislative session, there was business before the Senate. That was the bill which was being considered by the Senate at the time the unanimous-consent agreement went into effect. We went back into legislative session, and as in legislative session we adjourned. If we had not adjourned as in legislative session, the Senate would have opened the next morning in executive session, but we went back into legislative session, and this bill was before the Senate at the time we went back into legislative session, was before the Senate at the time the Senate in legislative session adjourned, and thus became the unfinished business, and is now properly the business before the Senate.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Can the Senator cite me to any rule which provides that?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator knows that that is true, and I am not going to satisfy the Senator by going through these rules to point out something that has been accepted as a rule all the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill was taken up on motion during the morning hour, and its consideration proceeded with until the hour of 2 o'clock, at which time the Senate, under an order previously agreed to, proceeded to the consideration of executive business. There was no unfinished legislative business to be laid down at 2 o'clock. Under numerous Senate precedents a legislative matter under consideration at the time the Senate goes into executive session is not displaced. Had it not been for the agreement for an executive session at 2 o'clock, the consideration of the so-called maternity bill would have been continued beyond that hour. The Chair has given attention to the precedent of the Senate, which has been referred to, found in Volume II of Giffey's Precedents, page 184, where a bill was taken up during the morning hour on motion at a time when there was no unfinished business to be laid down at 2 o'clock. A parliamentary inquiry was made as to whether or not its consideration would continue beyond that hour, when the Vice President—Thomas R. Marshall—decided that if there were unfinished business it would expire then, but there being no unfinished business it would proceed until displaced by something else.

The Senate did not return to legislative session on the day the maternity bill was taken up, and it being the last thing under consideration when the Senate went into executive session, and not having been displaced by any other legislative matter, prior to adjournment on that day, the Chair thinks that under the rule it thereby became, upon adjournment, the unfinished business for the next day at 2 o'clock. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order made by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, when this bill was last under consideration the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] had certain material put into the Record upon which I should like to comment for a few moments.

The Senator from Ohio, in his charming manner, and in his zeal for information, and in order that the information might come from the highest source, asked to have a part of the Budget message on maternity and infancy put into the Record, and insisted that it be read from the desk. It seemed to me at the time that there was something omitted, but I was unable to find out exactly what it was until what was read was printed in the Record the next day. I then discovered that only half of what the President of the United States had to say on the subject of maternity and infancy was printed in the Record. The other half the Senator did

not ask to have read from the desk, and therefore I ask that that half now be read by the clerk.

Mr. WILLIS. Will not the Senator ask that all of that paragraph be read?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not think it is necessary that the first part be read again. It has already been read several times.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

Mr. BINGHAM. I understand that the Senator from Ohio would like to have it all read.

Mr. WILLIS. Read the whole paragraph.

Mr. BINGHAM. I did not desire to have the time of the Senate taken up unnecessarily.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator does not desire to put the Chief Executive in a false light, and he ought, as a matter of fairness, have the whole paragraph on the subject read. Will he not do that as a matter of fairness to the Chief Executive?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am perfectly willing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

No estimate is submitted for carrying on the work under the maternity and infancy act, approved November 23, 1921, inasmuch as the authorization of appropriations for this purpose was fulfilled with the appropriation for 1927. A bill is now pending before Congress extending the provisions of that act to the fiscal years 1928 and 1929. If and when that measure becomes law I propose sending to the Congress a supplemental estimate for an appropriation to make its provisions effective. I am in favor of the proposed legislation extending the period of operation of this law with the understanding and hope that the administration of the funds to be provided would be with a view to the gradual withdrawal of the Federal Government from this field, leaving to the States, who have been paid by Federal funds and schooled under Federal supervision, the privilege and duty of maintaining this important work without aid or interference from the Federal Government.

Mr. BINGHAM. That much was read the other day, and in the interest of fairness, as the Senator from Ohio has said, let us now hear the balance of the section of the message dealing with maternity and infancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I have referred in previous Budget messages to the advisability of restricting and curtailing Federal subsidies to the States. The maternity act offers concrete opportunity to begin this program. The States should now be in a position to walk alone along this highway of helpful endeavor, and I believe it in the interest of the States and the Federal Government to give them the opportunity.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I would like particularly to call attention to those last words, that—

I believe it in the interest of the States and the Federal Government to give them the opportunity.

And—

The States should now be in a position to walk alone along this highway.

In connection with that, I desire to refer to what the Senator from New York put into the Record the other day, because it bears out what I said some days ago on this subject in calling attention to the fact that the people who are bringing pressure to bear to get this kind of legislation passed, the people who are interested in promoting paternalism, and the excellent lobbyists that they maintain in Washington, are bringing pressure to bear where pressure counts, namely, in connection with votes and political organizations rather than in connection with the best interests of the people.

It may be presumed that the physicians of this country, by and large, with a few distinguished exceptions, like my friend the Senator from New York, are opposed to this legislation. One letter the Senator from New York put into the Record came from the commissioner of health of the State of New York, in which he said that during the past year he—

was able to spend some \$10,000 in the interest of postgraduate medical education in maternity and child hygiene. Lectures, demonstrations, and clinics in these subjects—

Have been given, and so forth.

It is questionable whether State funds for this purpose would be forthcoming in the future.

There is a fine instance of the Federal Government being asked to do the very kind of thing for which State funds ought to be spent, and we have the evidence of the commissioner of health of the State of New York admitting it.

Included in the material which the Senator from New York put into the Record is a letter from the "chairman of legislation" on behalf of the members of the League of Women Voters of Brooklyn, a political organization interested in influencing votes, in which it is stated that—

The members of the League of Women Voters of the ninth assembly district of Brooklyn urge you to vote for the two-year extension of the Sheppard-Towner grant. We appreciate the support you have given to this much-needed aid.

But among the documents which the Senator from New York put in a little later we find another communication from Brooklyn of a very different sort, a communication from the secretary of the Medical Society of the County of Kings, representing 1,700 registered physicians. Physicians are usually so very busy with their many calls for the public health that few of them have an opportunity to take an active part in politics, not nearly so active as the League of Women Voters. But hear what the representatives of 1,700 registered physicians in Brooklyn had to say:

Inclosed you will find a copy of the resolution passed unanimously at the December meeting of this society.

Mr. President, then follows the resolutions from the Medical Society of the County of Kings, of Brooklyn, wherein it is stated that the operation of this act has effected a reduction in the birth rate, and, furthermore, that—

the Medical Society of the County of Kings * * * condemns the specialized medicine—

of this maternity act and urges the defeat of this legislation.

These things which the Senator from New York put into the Record appear significant as calling attention to the kind of pressure that is being brought to bear, on the one hand, political pressure of well-meaning people who are not really as well posted about these matters as they might be, and, on the other hand, the evidence of the physicians of the great city of Brooklyn, in opposition.

At this point I ask to have read at the desk a very brief editorial from the New England Homestead, a paper having a very large circulation among the farms and homes of New England. It is very brief.

The editorial was read, as follows:

[From New England Homestead, week ending December 11, 1926]

MORE BUREAUCRACY

With Congress in session again efforts are being made to railroad through the Senate an extension by one year of the Sheppard-Towner law. It expires with 1926 unless renewed, and the purpose back of the present effort is to gain time so this form of Federal aid may become fastened upon the people as a permanency. Instead of protection for mothers and infants, alleged to be inadequately safeguarded under State laws, the scheme now "blossoms out as a full-fledged public-health measure." Not content with seeking to dominate our homes and schools, Federal bureaucrats would oust the States from authority over the public health. A sane act will be for the Senate to kill the pending bill. Thus take at least one step toward stopping the encroachment of Nation into State affairs.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Connecticut does not believe for a moment that of the 1,700 physicians in Brooklyn, any material number attended the meeting where those resolutions were passed. I know nothing about the meeting, but I assume that there were about 35 doctors there.

Mr. BINGHAM. This is the second time that organization has gone on record, and if the other 1,700 objected, no doubt they would not have permitted the resolution to pass again.

Mr. COPELAND. There is no question at all, in my judgment, that such organizations of the medical profession as have taken part in any discussion of this matter have taken the same position the physicians in Brooklyn have taken. For my part, too, I would think it unwise and unnecessary for the Federal Government to continue indefinitely an appropriation of this nature. The only way in which private initiative or unusual governmental activity should be called upon, in my opinion, is in an educational way in establishing a new thought in medicine or in social life.

I had hoped, and I still hope, that this experiment in medicine might have an effect upon the States in encouraging them as independent agencies to go on with this work, which, in my judgment, is life-saving, and which should and which I believe does commend itself to every Member of the Senate. I know very well that the Senator from Connecticut, with his warm heart and his fine character, would not under any circumstances advocate any sort of legislation or stand in the way of legislation if he did not believe that his position would make ultimately for the betterment of the Nation.

Whenever I look upon the Senator from Connecticut I am reminded that the finest Democrat in the United States Senate is the junior Senator from Connecticut himself, and I say that without any disparagement of the eminent Democrats upon my own side of the Chamber. There is no question in my mind that ultimately the Senator will be sitting over here.

The Senator from Connecticut believes that this function is primarily a State function, and I think he is right. I believe it, too. I do not think the proponents of the measure should expect that year after year they can come here for money for this purpose. If this measure is a worthy one, if it has in it the possibilities of lessening death among expectant mothers and lessening the infant death rate, the demonstration of the possibilities of prenatal care and care in childbirth should make the legislative body of any State take interest enough in it to make the appropriation needed for the carrying on of the work within the State. But, Mr. President, this experiment has not been finished. There are pending activities in many States of the Union which can not be completed without action by the Congress in granting this appropriation.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WADSWORTH in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BAYARD. Will the Senator explain just what he means by that statement? Do they not have activities now which they maintain without any Federal appropriation?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator who has just taken his seat is so well informed regarding the activities in individual States in this matter that he knows the foresighted legislators count upon Federal appropriations. Many States, believing that the appropriation will be continued for at least another two years, have organized their own activities accordingly.

I am not pleading at this time certainly for the establishment of a policy which is to be perpetuated. I make no plea for New York State for this fund. The legislature in my State during one administration refused to take the money, but itself made the appropriation. But taking my State as an example, if my State has made preparation for a social program which contemplates the use of the share we will get of the appropriation, that program will fall down unless this money is given.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I think the appropriation made was for five years. In order to meet the argument advanced by the Senator now it is proposed by the committee to extend it for one more year. It is so proposed by the bill. I think the committee recommended one extra year, or two years in all. How many years does the Senator want to continue the Federal aid?

Mr. COPELAND. My own thought has been that we would continue it for two years. That is what I have had in mind.

Mr. BROUSSARD. When the bill was originally passed it was proposed to continue it for four or five years.

Mr. COPELAND. Originally it was for five years.

Mr. BROUSSARD. And now it is proposed to continue it for two more years?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; but it was certainly the opinion of the committee that with the appropriation this year would go out, in effect, a mandate that this is the end of the Federal appropriation, and that is my attitude of mind.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BAYARD. Why has not the mandate gone out already as we approach the end of the five-year term under the original bill? Why should a succeeding mandate go out for an extension of one or two years? If it be a mandate at all, why will there not be an unending mandate, an unending suggestion to the legislatures of all the States to put up the claim or cry, or whatever we please to call it, that "hereafter and until Congress fails to legislate we are going to make our budget based on a possible Federal appropriation"?

Mr. COPELAND. I recognize the force of what the Senator says, but nevertheless if there was an implied mandate at the time of the original appropriation it did not quite penetrate the minds of the advocates of the measure. At any rate, human nature is such that it is hard to remember anything five years.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator will remember that in the hearings before the House committee within the last 12 months one of the leading advocates of the measure, Miss Abbott, of

the Children's Bureau, was asked whether two years, as the House had it, was sufficient. She said no, that she was only for the two-year provision because that was all she could get at the present time. She was asked whether five years would be sufficient and she said she thought it might be. But she put no limit on it and made it perfectly evident to the committee, quite frankly, that they were asking for two years now because that was all the Budget would let them have at the present time.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHIPSTEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BAYARD. May I say, in connection with what the Senator from Connecticut just said, that Miss Abbott was one of the chief sponsors for the original bill and stood for its passage all the way through on a five-year basis.

Mr. COPELAND. In reply to the Senators, I will say that, of course, there are thousands of persons in the country and thousands of them in my own State who desire to have the appropriation continue year after year. Why are they so interested? If there is one person in the world who deserves the thoughtful consideration not alone of every member of her immediate household but of her entire community it is the prospective mother. We can go through any cemetery, I do not care where it is, and if we read the inscriptions upon the tombstones, as I have done many times, we will often see recorded there the fact that underneath that stone lies a young mother 19 years of age or 20 or 22 or 23 years of age, and beside her grave is the grave of an infant who died at birth or soon after. It is by reason of the sentiment in the hearts of our people that they are asking for this money, because they believe by its expenditure there may be promulgated knowledge which will result in saving the lives of these young mothers and of these infants.

I am in the fullest sympathy with the doctrine that the Government ought not to be made a nursing bottle. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and I had a little debate yesterday. I told him afterwards that he was so bright and so alert that it was not quite fair for him to cross swords with some of us who have not his ability in debate. But he is perfectly sincere in his belief that the individual State is qualified to deal with these problems. I believe that, too, and I think that in this matter, if we see fit this year to continue the appropriation, it must be with the understanding that with the appropriation goes a mandate that each State hereafter must adjust its own affairs to take care of its work in this particular activity.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BAYARD. I would like to ask the Senator to reconcile his statement with a statement made, I think in December last, by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] that this is permanent legislation.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Texas is amply able to speak for himself.

Mr. BAYARD. Did he make a correct interpretation of the bill if he made that statement?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not know what the Senator from Texas had in his mind. He sits so close to the Senator from Delaware that he might readily be asked the question.

Mr. BAYARD. He was speaking about the present bill which is sought to be extended.

Mr. COPELAND. I am not putting words in the mouth of the senior Senator from Texas; neither am I taking any from him.

Mr. President, a moment ago the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] referred to a letter which I placed in the Record yesterday from the very able health commissioner of the State of New York. He quoted from the letter, as I recall, that a sum of \$10,000 of Federal money had been used by the health commissioner of New York State to institute graduate courses in maternity work.

Mr. President, do you know that every time you see 10 crippled children you see a group including 5 children who are crippled because of hasty and imperfect obstetrics? There is not any man in this world who has greater pride and belief in the medical profession than have I, but the medical profession does not differ from the legal profession or the teaching profession or any other profession. There are men in every profession who are brilliant, capable, outstanding, able men, but in every profession there are men who are careless, indifferent, and commercial in their thoughts. In the medical profession, I am sorry to say, there are a few men who are almost heartless in their dealings with human ills; but I believe it is the desire of every physician to equip himself thoroughly so that

he may have the skill and the ability to deal with all the emergencies of practice.

Now, let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that if the health commissioner of New York State has been able, by the expenditure of \$10,000 from this fund, to increase the knowledge of the profession in my State in the problems associated with maternity, and through that expenditure hundreds of women who must go through the tortures of childbirth in the future will have an easier time, I thank God that that money has been spent.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Preliminary to the questions that I am going to ask the Senator—and I am not asking them in any controversial spirit, but I wish to get his viewpoint—I wish to recall that the Senator has said that occasionally there are doctors who are mercenary—I will not use the exact language, I am trying to express the thought—some of them even cruel.

Mr. COPELAND. Heartless.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Or heartless and incompetent. Does the Senator from New York know of any State where there is not, first, a requirement that a physician shall possess certain qualifications before he is licensed to practice?

Mr. COPELAND. I do not.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator know of any State where there is not a State board that has a general supervision over the practice of medicine, at least to the extent that physicians who are guilty of unprofessional conduct may be called before that board?

Mr. COPELAND. In a general way, I should say that there is no such State. Of course, that is not quite literally true, but it is practically so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is it not generally true in the States that the qualifications for admission to the practice of medicine are reasonably high and that the States have been generally increasing the strictness of the rules?

Mr. COPELAND. That is true.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If these things are true, what is this board going to do by the expenditure of this money which the State machinery does not already care for?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, these are very interesting and pertinent questions which are being asked by the able Senator from Missouri. As the Senator well knows, all that the law requires of a physician is average ability. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I presume that would undoubtedly be correct; that a man should possess—I will not say average ability—but that he should possess that degree of skill which the responsibility of his profession necessarily demands. I assume, since the Senator from New York has said that physicians must possess the qualifications which are laid down by the law and the regulations of the State boards, that there we find our initial safeguard, and there the qualifications are first determined. What can this board do that is not already done with reference to that?

Mr. COPELAND. It is expected of every physician that he will possess the average professional ability of the community or of the State; but certainly the Senator from Missouri recognizes that in dealing with childbirth, in meeting the emergencies of the chamber at that time, if the woman there under treatment is one near and dear to the Senator from Missouri or to me, he wants the attending obstetrician to have more than average ability; he wants him to be possessed of all the requirements which will make him capable of dealing with the complications of that trying experience. My contention is—and I say this with all respect to the great body of the profession of medicine—that the average physician who has occasion to deal with the patient under such circumstances is possessed of more than average ability and is prepared to meet the common complications of childbirth. But this is not true of every last member of the profession by any means.

Returning to the question of the Senator from Connecticut and to apply it—

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the Senator has not answered my question at all.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will be patient, I think, perhaps, I will answer it later. I wish to do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I thought the Senator was going to another question.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to answer every question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. My question is: What is this board going to do to provide a remedy where there are cruel physi-

cians that can not be done under the machinery of the State that the Senator has said it has already set up?

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, Mr. President, there is not any process of law or any method known to man which will remove cruelty from the hearts of men.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Well, to correct ignorance. What is this board going to do to correct ignorance that is not already provided by the machinery of the State which the Senator concedes is set up? I want to get at what they are going to do; and I will make my statement very plain, if the Senator will permit me the time.

We have in the United States many wonderful universities at which it is presumed the last word of medical lore is taught to medical students. We have, in addition to such universities, I believe I might almost say thousands but certainly hundreds of medical schools, organized under the laws of the various States, charged with the responsibility of teaching all there is of medical lore. We have, in addition to this, postgraduate courses in the various State colleges; and we have hospitals in the great cities open to medical students and practitioners for observation—I will not say experimentation, although at times that might be justified within certain limits. We have trained nurses in every community of any size or accessible to any community of any size in the United States. These nurses are taught in schools and colleges and work immediately under the direction of physicians. This vast machinery exists; and I want to know what a board of five or six officials in Washington can do. I can not speak now with reference to the present board, for I do not know its personnel, but at the time this bill was here for debate on a previous occasion that board consisted, to all intents and purposes, of one woman—an unmarried woman—aided by a number of other unmarried women, women who had never been mothers, of course, for they had never been married. They were not learned in medicine. They were not even trained nurses. I want to know what knowledge that kind of a board can contribute to the medical fraternity of the United States, which has open to it all of these avenues of learning to which I have adverted. I want to know what they are doing and how they are doing it, and how this board could convey to my learned friend here—who is an eminent physician—learning that is not already in the weighty tomes of his office and is not the common knowledge of the medical fraternity of the United States.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, has the Senator finished?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; I have tried to make my point clear.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator has succeeded admirably, Mr. President, as he always does. I wish I had the gift of making points clear on all occasions that the Senator from Missouri has; but I think I can make an answer, even though it be not an effective answer, to what the Senator has said.

The Senator, of course, has come in contact with the medical profession all his life; and he knows that there is no man in any community so much a slave to the duties of his profession as the physician. There is only one person in the world, a stranger to you, whom you would think of calling on the telephone in the middle of the night or early in the morning before he has had his breakfast, or in the middle of the forenoon when it is sleeting and snowing. There is only one person you would take away from the theater or from some social function. The doctor is the slave of everybody. If there is one man in the world who works 24 hours in the day and 7 days in the week and 52 weeks in the year, and all the years of his life, it is the doctor.

In my State—and that is what I was referring to when I turned again to the Senator from Connecticut—the commissioner of health of the State has undertaken to take into different parts of the State eminent authorities on the subject of obstetrics and the subject of the care of infants.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator say that this board had undertaken to do that?

Mr. COPELAND. The commissioner of health in my State—not the board in Washington. Let me say, Mr. President, that I think the Senator from Missouri laid emphasis upon the fact that somebody in the board here was not married.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I laid no emphasis on it. I just stated it as a fact. I do not know what this board is now. I know what it was when we were making this appropriation.

Mr. COPELAND. Will the Senator, while we are passing, tell us just what that has to do with it?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; I will tell you.

It occurs to me that if I were a woman and were rearing children, I would rather have the advice of some good old mother of Israel who had reared some children than of some woman who had never had any experience at all; but I would

rather have the advice of a skilled physician than either of them if he were a really skilled physician; but if he were a blunderer or a cruel man I would rather go to the old lady who had raised a brood of children. I think it has that much to do with it. I think experience is of some value.

To answer the Senator a little more at length, I do not believe that I could give advice to the doctors of this country as to how they should run their business. If I can not do it because of a lack of experience, I do not see how a board consisting of inexperienced women can do it. I say "I." I am using myself now to represent men in common, because I might be the last and the worst man in the world; so let me change my statement. I do not see how an ordinary man without experience can manage a board that will give any very valuable advice to physicians who have had a great deal of experience.

I have seen some of these books entitled "Every Man His Own Lawyer"; and it is a common maxim at the bar that those books have made more valuable litigation for lawyers than all the other books ever written. Some poor fellow gets one of them, and he thinks he can conduct his own business; of course, he does not understand the principles involved and he blunders, and a lawsuit ensues, and the lawyers make money out of it. I am inclined to think that advice scattered broadcast throughout each State on how to rear children is very likely to be followed by women with the best intentions in the world, and they will diagnose the case wrongly and be giving remedies for chicken-pox that ought to be given for the measles; and I think there are probably more little white coffins under these tombstones over which my friend stood with bowed head and almost wept a minute ago that are filled with the corpses of children that people have sought to doctor without adequate knowledge than the number of children that have ever been saved by undertaking to educate people generally to be their own doctors.

I say that in all seriousness. If anybody that is near to me is sick, or if I am sick myself, I do just what my friend the Senator and physician says: I call my doctor, whether it is 1 o'clock in the morning or whenever it is, and I want him. Whenever you undertake to teach the people to be their own doctors, you are going to have disasters. Then, when you undertake to teach the doctors, if that is the business of this board over here, they start out without any learning, without any skill; and what can they do to aid the doctor that the doctor can not a thousand times better get from the great universities of the land?

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator, and may I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that this bill gives to this board the power to direct what in its opinion is the appropriate and necessary method of expending this money in the States?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest, as I always do, to what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has said; and I hope he has no more serious objections to the bill than those he has named in his address. If the purpose of this bill were to subsidize uninformed laymen, and the money were to be spent by untrained persons in the way suggested by the Senator from Missouri, I would join hands with him at once and vote against this appropriation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is it not being expended in just that way in part?

Mr. COPELAND. Well, I should say it was a very infinitesimal part.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think I have some of it here.

Mr. COPELAND. Are they spending money for all the material shown, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. REED of Missouri. These are all pamphlets that they have sent out.

Mr. COPELAND. I assume that those are pamphlets relating to the care of infants.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I expect to read them all in this debate, too.

Mr. COPELAND. We will have an extra session, then.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Not to get this bill up.

Mr. COPELAND. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to stay here. I have found that in the springtime the climate of Washington is unexcelled, and I am perfectly satisfied to stay and hear the reading of these pamphlets, because by getting them into the Record I have no doubt that there will be disseminated a lot of very valuable information which will be helpful to the people of the United States.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, does the Senator think expectant mothers throughout the country are going to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. I hope not; I hope not.

Mr. BAYARD. Why? Does the Senator object to the contents of these pamphlets?

Mr. COPELAND. I have not heard them yet.

Mr. BAYARD. They are put out by this bureau that the Senator is boasting about.

Mr. COPELAND. But, regardless of what these pamphlets have in them, I would not want any expectant mother to have the shock which would come on any occasion from reading any issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have too much regard for the women of this country, and too little regard for some issues of the RECORD, to take any chance on that calamity.

But, now, to come back to our muttons:

The Senator from Connecticut has called attention to the statement made by the commissioner of health of the State of New York. How much do we get in New York from this, may I ask the Senator from Missouri? One hundred thousand dollars, is it not?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not know what you get in New York. I am sure you get your share.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope so, because, if we do get our share, it will be the first time we ever got our share of any Federal appropriation.

The letter to me from the commissioner of health of the State of New York says—and I quote again what the Senator from Connecticut read:

You will, as a physician, be interested in the fact that, with the permission of the Children's Bureau at Washington, I was able to spend some \$10,000 in the interest of postgraduate medical education in maternity and child hygiene. Lectures, demonstrations, and clinics in these subjects, given by qualified members of the medical profession—

Not by the unmarried ladies mentioned by the Senator from Missouri—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Who was able to do this?

Mr. COPELAND. The health commissioner of New York State.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, that is true enough; but they administer the portion of the moneys given by Federal aid under the supervision and control of the people here in Washington in this bureau. Do not get away from that. You can not escape it under the terms of your law.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware is mistaken about that.

Mr. COPELAND. Just one minute. If the Senator is right, and all the money spent under this act is as well spent under the direction of the board as it is in the State of New York, I congratulate the board and the country.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does anybody doubt that that is an illegal expenditure under this bill?

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean this money that is spent in New York?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; to take it and use it in your ordinary educational institutions in the State of New York; to take it to educate individuals. Is anything of that kind contemplated in this bill?

Mr. COPELAND. I would think myself that if the money were used in the ordinary educational institutions of New York it would not be a proper use of the funds. But if the Senator will listen, I will read again:

I was able to spend some \$10,000 in the interest of postgraduate medical education in maternity and child hygiene. Lectures, demonstrations, and clinics in these subjects, given by qualified members of the medical profession, have been, in my opinion and in the opinion of the medical profession of the State, a very great success.

They did not do this in any educational institution. They had a sort of a traveling university.

Mr. REED of Missouri. In New York?

Mr. COPELAND. In New York.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is not New York able to pay for it?

Mr. COPELAND. Well able to pay for it, and if the Senator will recall, I said a little while ago I am not begging for New York.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Then why do we have this board down here to do something of this kind if New York is able to pay for it? New York is taking care of her people pretty well, I think.

Mr. COPELAND. I wish the people of some foreign lands were as well taken care of; I will not say of any State.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; and I think she takes care of her people as well as any State in the Union does.

Mr. COPELAND. That is very kind of the Senator, and I think he is right about it.

Mr. BAYARD. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. BAYARD. The Senator from Texas interrupted a moment ago when I made a statement with regard to the power of the board to supervise and direct the expenditures in this matter. I refer to section 11 of the present act now in force, which is sought to be extended, in which provision is made that the board here may direct how the money shall be expended.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I respectfully submit that the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BAYARD. In my own time I will read section 11 and comment on it.

Mr. COPELAND. I am very sorry to interrupt this colloquy. I did not intend to extend my own remarks over so long a period of time, but I have been so interested in the comments made by the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Missouri, and the able Democrat from Connecticut, that I have been tempted to run on at greater length than I had expected. But let me say just in conclusion—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Before the Senator concludes, will he not answer my question, what this board of laymen, or laywomen, without any special knowledge, without any special learning, are going to do with this great fund of knowledge to bring forth something new and useful which the States do not know and which the profession does not know? I would like to know what they are doing.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator from Missouri wish to have me tell him that?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Tell us what they are doing. Let us find out what they are doing with all this money.

Mr. COPELAND. How much money, may I ask the Senator from Texas, is being spent in the central board? What proportion of the fund is being spent in Washington?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It does not amount to more than 5 per cent.

Mr. COPELAND. A very small amount.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The whole central force numbers about 11, and competent physicians are represented on the central board.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Represented on the central board?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; on the Federal force.

Mr. REED of Missouri. When were they added?

Mr. SHEPPARD. They have been on the board for quite a while. I shall get the names and put them in the RECORD. I do not recall them now.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I did not expect the Senator to recall them now.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But they are there.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If there is a physician on this board, he has been added long since the board was created. As originally created, there was only one married woman on the board, and her husband had some sort of a job. It was a kind of a family matter there. I think he got the job because he had the wife.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The entire list of officials will be put in the RECORD.

Mr. BAYARD. Will the Senator state how much money of the appropriations is spent for publications by the board here in Washington, and how much is spent to cause that information to be disseminated?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That I do not recall at the present time; it is my recollection that the limit is 5 per cent of the annual appropriation.

Mr. BAYARD. It is a very substantial amount of the appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I remember, they are limited to 5 per cent of the appropriation for the work here in Washington.

Mr. BAYARD. That is for the actual administration.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, indeed; for the entire work in Washington, if I remember correctly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Limited by the law?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Limited by the law, if I remember correctly. On the spur of the moment it may not be possible for me to be exactly accurate.

Mr. COPELAND. May I ask the Senator from Texas if I am right in assuming that the pamphlets referred to so eloquently by the Senator from Missouri, and which he is going to read into the RECORD during the springtime, are written by laymen, or are they written by physicians?

Mr. SHEPPARD. They are written by physicians and others technically familiar with the subjects with which they deal.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator means by that graduate nurses, skilled nurses?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Possibly some are nurses; all are versed and practiced in their various topics.

Mr. COPELAND. In other words, the matter which is sent forth from the central office is of high scientific worth.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is a rather large deduction to make from the statement that has been made, "written by nurses."

Mr. COPELAND. Does not the Senator from Missouri believe that a well-trained, competent nurse—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Ought to write a book on medicine? No. She can not turn her hand over in a sick room except in accordance with the direction of the physician in charge.

Mr. COPELAND. Now, if the Senate will hold itself at ease for a moment, I will conclude my discussion.

The Senator from Missouri and I have agreed, I think it is safe to say, that this discussion, since it is to be continued all through the spring, need not terminate to-day. But just before I conclude I do want to say that I think there are many graduate nurses who are so proficient in their knowledge of the profession which they follow that they might well produce articles and formulate advice which would be useful in the prevention of disease and would convey useful knowledge to expectant mothers.

With that statement, I am very glad to terminate the day's debate, and to say to the Senator from Connecticut and others that at any time, so far as I am concerned, I shall be very happy to continue.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], by virtue of the fact that he is now presiding, is not able to read into the RECORD, as I wish to have read, a telegram he received to-day upon the matter now before the Senate from Dr. Charles H. Mayo, of Rochester, Minn. I send the telegram to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHIPSTEAD in the chair). The clerk will read the telegram.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

ROCHESTER, MINN., January 3, 1927.

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Federal aid for maternity and infancy work as provided by Sheppard-Towner act should be continued because inestimable public good results directly from this expenditure and also indirectly by stimulating individual States to carry on this valuable educational work. * * *

CHARLES H. MAYO.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15008) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAGEE of New York, Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, Mr. WASON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. LEE of Georgia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McNARY. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the Agricultural Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15008) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding officer appointed Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. KENDRICK conferees on the part of the Senate.

NATIONAL ORIGIN PROVISION OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1924 (S. DOC. NO. 190)

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I understand that there is upon the Vice President's desk a message from the President in response to the resolution offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] yesterday. May it be presented to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Immigration:

To the Senate:

In response to Senate Resolution 318 there is herewith transmitted a copy of the joint report of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor to the President, in pursuance of section 11 (e) of the immigration act of 1924.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 7, 1927.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The accompanying report is brief, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and also as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

JANUARY 3, 1927.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of sections 11 and 12 of the immigration act of 1924, we have the honor to transmit herewith the report of the subcommittee appointed by us for the purpose of determining the quota of each nationality in accordance with the provisions of said sections.

The report of the subcommittee is self-explanatory, and, while it is stated to be a preliminary report, yet it is believed that further investigation will not substantially alter the conclusions arrived at.

It may be stated that the statistical and historical information available from which these computations were made is not entirely satisfactory. Assuming, however, that the issuance of the proclamation provided for in paragraph (3), section 11, of said act is mandatory and that Congress will neither repeal nor amend said act on or before April 1, 1927, the attached list shows substantially the quota allotments for use in said proclamation.

Faithfully yours,

FRANK B. KELLOGG,
Secretary of State,
Department of State.
HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce.
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DECEMBER 15, 1926.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE, the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, and the SECRETARY OF LABOR.

SIRS: The board which you appointed to conduct investigations and submit a report containing recommendations respecting immigration quotas upon the basis of national origin, which may be reported to the President, as required by section 11 of the immigration act of 1924, submits the following preliminary statement in the belief that you may wish to be informed regarding the progress the board is making.

We have found our task by no means simple, but we are carrying it out by methods which we believe to be statistically correct, utilizing the data that are available in accordance with what seems to us to be the intent and meaning of the law. We have not completed our work, but the figures which we are submitting for your information, though provisional and subject to revision, indicate approximately what the final results will be.

The available data which furnished the basis of our computations include:

(1) The records of immigration giving the number of immigrants arriving annually from each foreign country from 1820 to 1920.

(2) The reports of the decennial censuses which have classified the foreign-born population by country of birth at each census from that of 1850 to that of 1920, inclusive; the native white population of foreign or mixed parentage by country of birth of parents at each census from that of 1890 to that of 1920, inclusive; and both the foreign-born white population and the native white population of foreign or mixed parentage by mother tongue at the censuses of 1910 and 1920.

(3) A classification by racial stocks of the white population enumerated at the census of 1790 as published by the Bureau of the Census in the volume entitled "A Century of Population Growth."

(4) Standard reference works giving the population of foreign countries at different periods, by Provinces and other small political divisions, and by linguistic and racial groups.

It does not seem to us advisable or, indeed, practicable in this connection or at this time to undertake to give anything like a complete description of the statistical processes which we have applied in reaching the results which we submit. To do that would require a voluminous and rather technical report, which probably would be of interest mainly to statisticians. The first step in our computations was the division of the total white population into two main portions, one representing that portion which is descended from the population which was enumerated in the first census, that of 1790, and the other that

portion which consists of immigrants and the descendants of immigrants who have come to this country since 1790. The one portion we call for convenience the "original native stock" and the other the "immigrant stock." This division was based on census statistics and was made by a process which is believed to be more scientific and reliable than any heretofore applied to that problem. It may interest you to know that according to this computation, of the 94,820,915 white population of the United States as enumerated in 1920, approximately 53,500,000 were of immigrant stock and 41,000,000 of original native stock.

Having made this division, the foreign-born and the native-born children of foreign-born parents were allocated to quota areas on the basis of the 1920 census classifications by country of origin, adjustments being made where necessary for geographical changes; and the balance of the immigrant stock (comprising the grandchildren and later descendants of immigrants) was distributed by country of origin partly upon the basis of statistics of immigration and partly upon the basis of census statistics, again making allowance for changes in political geography.

For the classification of the other portion of the population, constituting what we have termed the original native stock, the only comprehensive data available is that supplied by the classification, previously mentioned, of the 1790 population, which was based mainly upon the names recorded in the schedules returned at the census, distinguishing English, Scotch, Irish, Dutch, French, German, and "all others." It must be admitted that any racial classification based mainly upon names involves a considerable element of uncertainty, partly because family names undergo changes as time goes by and partly because many names are common to two, or possibly more, countries. The work of making this classification was, however, carefully done by people who were by no means lacking in qualifications for the task; and who did not rely exclusively upon names, but consulted histories and works on nomenclature to some extent. Moreover, the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show that it was the expectation of Congress that the 1790 classification here referred to would be used as a basis in carrying out the provisions of the act regarding the determination of national origin.

As regards most of the nationalities of more recent immigration, their quotas would not be affected appreciably, if at all, by any errors that may exist in this classification of the 1790 population, because they were not represented in any considerable numbers in the population of the United States at that time. As regards the other countries, whose quotas are based in part upon the 1790 population, just what the margin of error resulting from uncertainty in regard to the classification by names may be could be determined only by extended historical research. At present it must be largely a matter of opinion; and while the burden of proof appears to rest upon those who may object to the classification as being seriously erroneous, we are not prepared to say that their criticisms may not be in some cases or to some extent justified.

It is to be noted, however, that so far as the provisions of the immigration act of 1924 are concerned, an exact classification is neither expected nor required, for the act says that the determination of national origin shall be made "as nearly as may be." Your board believe that the results finally obtained, after such revisions as it may make within the next two or three months, will indicate the national origin of the population of the United States as nearly as may be ascertained with the available data and under existing conditions. A greater degree of accuracy could doubtless be obtained by a careful and exhaustive study of historical and genealogical records; but that is a task which might take several years for its completion and would require the assistance or cooperation of historians and experts in historical or genealogical research.

For your convenience the tabular statement herewith submitted includes the present quotas (based upon the foreign born enumerated in the 1890 census) for comparison with the preliminary quotas based on national origin. As of possible interest, there is added also a column showing the quotas as they were presented to Congress at the time the immigration act of 1924 was under discussion, as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 65, No. 159, June 24, 1924, pages 11739-11740. This column is introduced as indicating what Congress probably anticipated would be the results of the application of the national-origin basis.

It may perhaps have been anticipated that under the provisions of the immigration act the total immigration from quota countries would be 150,000. But the act, as your board understands it, does not definitely and directly limit the total immigration. It simply provides a rule by which the quota for each nationality is to be determined, that rule being that the annual quota "shall be a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin (ascertained as hereinafter provided in this section) bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920." In the opinion of your board, the quota of any country as determined by that rule must stand unaltered, unless it proves to be less than 100, in which case it is to be

Increased to that figure under the proviso that "the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100." As a result of increasing the quotas in such cases, the total is somewhat in excess of 150,000.

Respectfully submitted.

R. W. FLOURNOY, Jr.,
S. W. BOGGS,
Representing the Secretary of State.
JOSEPH A. HILL, *Chairman,*
LEON E. TRUESDELL,
Representing the Secretary of Commerce.
W. W. HUSBAND,
ETHELBERT STEWART,
Representing the Secretary of Labor.

IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

Provisional immigration quotas based on national origin, as provided by the immigration act of 1924; also present immigration quotas as based on 1890 foreign-born population; and estimated quotas on national origin basis as submitted to Congress when the act of 1924 was under consideration.

Country of origin	Provisional quotas on basis of national origin	Present quotas based on 1890 foreign-born population	Estimated quotas on national origin basis as submitted to Congress in 1924
Total.....	153,541	164,667	1150,000
Afghanistan.....	100	100	100
Albania.....	100	100	100
Andorra.....	100	100	100
Arabian peninsula.....	100	100	100
Armenia.....	100	124	100
Australia, etc.....	100	121	100
Austria.....	1,486	785	2,171
Belgium.....	410	512	251
Bhutan.....	100	100	100
Bulgaria.....	100	100	100
Cameroon (British).....	100	100	100
Cameroon (French).....	100	100	100
China.....	100	100	100
Czechoslovakia.....	2,248	3,073	1,339
Danzig.....	122	228	100
Denmark.....	1,044	2,789	945
Egypt.....	100	100	100
Estonia.....	109	124	325
Ethiopia (Abyssinia).....	100	100	100
Finland.....	559	471	517
France.....	3,837	3,954	1,772
Germany.....	24,428	51,227	20,028
Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	73,039	34,007	85,135
Greece.....	367	100	384
Hungary.....	967	473	1,521
Iceland.....	100	100	100
India.....	100	100	100
Iraq (Mesopotamia).....	100	100	100
Irish Free State.....	13,862	28,567	8,330
Italy, etc.....	6,091	3,845	5,716
Japan.....	100	100	100
Latvia.....	184	142	384
Liberia.....	100	100	100
Liechtenstein.....	100	100	100
Lithuania.....	494	344	458
Luxemburg.....	100	100	100
Monaco.....	100	100	100
Morocco.....	100	100	100
Muscat (Oman).....	100	100	100
Nauru.....	100	100	100
Nepal.....	100	100	100
Netherlands.....	2,421	1,648	2,762
New Zealand, etc.....	100	100	100
Norway.....	2,267	6,453	2,053
New Guinea, etc.....	100	100	100
Palestine.....	100	100	100
Persia.....	100	100	100
Poland.....	4,978	5,982	4,535
Portugal.....	290	503	236
Ruanda and Urundi.....	100	100	100
Rumania.....	516	603	222
Russia.....	4,781	2,248	4,002
Samoa, Western.....	100	100	100
San Marino.....	100	100	100
Siam.....	100	100	100
South Africa, Union of.....	100	100	100
Southwest Africa.....	100	100	100
Spain.....	674	131	148
Sweden.....	3,259	9,561	3,072
Switzerland.....	1,198	2,081	783
Syria and the Lebanon.....	100	100	100
Tanganyika.....	100	100	100
Togoland (British).....	100	100	100
Togoland (French).....	100	100	100
Turkey.....	233	100	100
Yap, etc.....	100	100	100
Yugoslavia.....	777	671	591

¹ Includes Fiume (100) and Hejaz (100).

DECEMBER 15, 1926.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 8, 1927, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 7, 1927

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas J. Sparks, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney, western district of Kentucky, vice W. Sherman Ball, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 7, 1927

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Marion F. Boatwright, Asheville.
William E. Crawford, Decatur.
Harry C. Peterson, Robertsdale.
Ed. P. Johnson, Samson.
Albert N. Holland, Scottsboro.

ARIZONA

Edward J. Huxtable, Douglas.
Warren F. Day, Prescott.

COLORADO

Henry J. Stahl, Central City.

IOWA

Dennis L. McDonnell, Bernard.
Charles A. Frisbee, Garner.
William C. Howell, Keokuk.
Jacob E. Rogers, Lenox.
Elsie A. Haskell, Luverne.
Willis G. Smith, Rock Rapids.
Baty K. Bradfield, Spirit Lake.

MICHIGAN

Harry B. McCain, Alpena.
Adam B. Greenawalt, Cassopolis.
George W. Weaver, Charlevoix.
Bert A. Dickerson, Constantine.
Andrew Bram, Hancock.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary C. Price, Whitmire.

UTAH

Jesse M. French, Greenriver.
Lydia R. Shaw, Huntington.
Glen A. Jensen, Manti.
Walter O. Lundgreen, Monroe.
Sidney W. Elswood, Tremonton.
Josephine H. Day, Woods Cross.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 7, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of the Anacostia Methodist Episcopal Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, we look to Thee again this day for the wisdom that shall guide us safely. May Thy mind discipline our own, and may we think Thy thoughts after Thee. Bless us in our private lives, in those relationships that enrich our lives, and in the public service we seek to render for our Nation. May we strive increasingly to be men after Thine own heart. We pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 14827. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for the Albert Gallatin statue in Washington, D. C.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 14827. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—CONGRESS OF MILITARY MEDICINE AND PHARMACY AT WARSAW, POLAND (S. DOC. NO. 186)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending, at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, constituting, together with the surgeon generals of the three medical services of the Treasury, War, and Navy Departments, an advisory board under the Federal act to incorporate the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States, approved January 30, 1903, that Congress be asked for an appropriation of \$5,000 for the payment of expenses of five delegates, three of whom shall represent the medical services of the War and Navy Departments and the United States Public Health Service, at the Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Warsaw, Poland, in 1927.

The recommendation has my approval, and I request of Congress legislation authorizing an appropriation of \$5,000 for the purpose of participation by the United States by official delegates in the Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy to be held at Warsaw, Poland, in 1927.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 7, 1927.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—EIGHTH PAN AMERICAN CONGRESS AT LIMA, PERU (S. DOC. NO. 185)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State with a copy of a letter to him from the Secretary of the Treasury, with related papers, requesting that an appropriation be authorized for the expenses of three delegates (two of whom shall be officers of the Public Health Service) to the Eighth Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Lima, Peru, from October 12-20, 1927. The especial attention of Congress is invited to the memorandum furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury of the reasons why it is believed the Government of the United States should be represented in the conference.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of the Treasury that participation by the United States in these Pan American sanitary conferences is of importance, and agree with the conclusion of the Secretary of State that such participation is in the public interest. I, therefore, request of Congress legislation authorizing an appropriation of \$3,000 for the expenses of delegates to the Eighth Pan American Sanitary Conference to be held at Lima, Peru, in October, 1927, in accordance with the draft of a joint resolution submitted with the papers herewith transmitted.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 5, 1927.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—PAN AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CHILD WELFARE AT MONTEVIDEO (S. DOC. NO. 184)

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the inclosed report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying paper, to the end that legislation may be enacted authorizing an appropriation of \$2,000 to enable acceptance

by the United States of membership in a Pan American Institute of Child Welfare at Montevideo, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of Labor joined in by the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 7, 1927.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following title:

S. 4702. An act to extend the time for construction of a bridge across the Kanawha River at Kanawha Falls, Fayette County, W. Va.;

S. 4831. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of Davidson County, of the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across Cumberland River at a point near Andersons Bluff, connecting Old Hickory or Jacksonville, Tenn., by way of the Gallatin Pike, with Nashville, in Davidson County, Tenn.; and

S. 4862. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Fayette and Washington Counties, Pa., to reconstruct the bridge across the Monongahela River at Belle Vernon, Fayette County, Pa.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15008, the agricultural appropriation bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 15008, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15008) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. MAGEE of New York, Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa, Mr. WASON, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. LEE of Georgia.

LOANS ON ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in the last few days our attention has been called somewhat to the question of making loans to the veterans of the World War on their certificates. There has been considerable said and some commotion and some dissatisfaction connected with this question. It seems that the banks throughout the country are divided into three classes on this question. In dealing with it they seem to have divided themselves into about three groups: First, a group which is desirous and anxious and ready to extend loans to the veterans of the World War on these certificates; secondly, a class of banks that seem desirous of making these loans, but at the same time they seem somewhat confused and bothered about what they might call the red tape connected with the question; and then, in the third group there seems to be a class of banks that are in no way interested in making the loans; and, in fact, seem desirous rather of discrediting the loans.

On the 31st day of December last a local paper in my State published this article, indicating the view that they took in regard to making these loans. I hand it to the Clerk, and ask that he read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATTENTION WAR VETERANS!

On and after January 2, 1927, through our membership in the Federal reserve system, we will be prepared to make loans to you on your adjusted service certificates. We will be glad to render this service to any veteran.

STATE EXCHANGE BANK OF MACON,

"The Old Reliable,"

Member Federal Reserve System.

Mr. ROMJUE. I congratulate the action of this bank and its president, Mr. Chris R. Maffry, and all other banking institutions that follow this lead and course.

You will find throughout the country a good many banks that view this matter from that standpoint. Before this question is settled it will be required of this Congress that it enact additional legislation. You doubtless have received copies of the regulations prescribed by the Veterans' Bureau—No. 163. I want to call your attention to a provision in that which ought to be rectified. In section 13303 the regulations of the Veterans' Bureau now provide that in the event a veteran goes to a bank and borrows money and puts up his certificate as security, that bank is required to send to the Veterans' Bureau a list of this loan, describing it in detail. It may be that the boy goes into the bank to borrow a small sum of money on his certificate for only a few days, and at the expiration or maturity of that loan he walks into the bank and pays it off. Now, it seems to me that the regulation of the Veterans' Bureau which requires the bank to report that transaction to the Veterans' Bureau is absolutely and wholly unnecessary, because it burdens a department of the Government with work that it ought not to be required to perform, because when a man comes in and pays the bank there is no reason in the world why a Government record should be kept of that transaction, and the regulation should be simply sufficient to meet all the requirements by providing that after the loan has matured and is not paid that information should be sent to the Veterans' Bureau, where the law requires it to be taken care of out of a special fund.

If you read these regulations, you will find, and I think you will agree with me, that the Veterans' Bureau ought to change that regulation and make that rule apply not to all loans but only to those that have not been paid. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President was communicated to the House by Mr. Latia, one of his secretaries.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a very short but very important letter which the President of the United States yesterday wrote to the local chairman here in Washington of the Committee of One Thousand. I have submitted it to the majority leader, to the minority leader, and to the Chair, and I would like to ask unanimous consent that it be read at the Clerk's desk. It is a very short letter but a very important one and does not bear on the naval bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to have a letter read by the Clerk written by the President of the United States to the chairman of the Committee of One Thousand. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 5, 1927.

Mr. W. T. GALLIHER,

Chairman, Federal American National Bank, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GALLIHER: Your invitation to attend the dinner given by the Committee of One Thousand at the New Willard Hotel has been received. I regret that it is not possible for me to make an address before your gathering on account of the press of official business. I want you to know that I regard the observance and enforcement of the law as exceedingly important to the public welfare of the Nation. This is a subject I have often discussed and desire constantly to emphasize. It is scarcely too much to say that all our rights, our liberty, and life itself are dependent for their protection on public law. If it fails to be enforced, government itself fails. If it fails to be observed, the very foundation on which self-government rests is weakened and destroyed. Anything that your organization can do to impress this principle on the public mind will be a distinct patriotic service. No country has ever reached a state of perfect law observance or enforcement. Every first-class government makes an honest and intelligent effort to enforce the law, and the standards of citizenship are very much lowered when there is any general failure to observe the law. I welcome the assistance of all organizations established for the purpose of supporting these principles.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15641) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

NAVAL ACADEMY

Pay, Naval Academy: Pay for professors and others, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, \$234,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$30,500 shall be paid for masters and instructors in swordsmanship and physical training.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of getting the floor, I move to strike out the paragraph. The Navy League of the United States is a private organization in no way connected with the Federal Government, with its principal office in Washington, D. C. To it belong some of the high and influential officers of the United States Navy.

The United States Naval Institute is another private organization, in no way connected with the United States Government, with its principal office in Annapolis, Md., to which belong some of the high and distinguished naval officers of the United States.

The President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the United States Navy. He outranks every officer in it. And the President of the United States has laid down a policy here, a naval policy, if you please, which precludes the building of these three proposed cruisers. And the President of the United States being the Commander in Chief of the Navy, and the superior officer of every naval officer in the naval establishment, they are presumed to uphold his policies and not oppose them.

I received this morning in the mail—and I presume each one of you also received this identical propaganda that came to me—a communication from this United States Navy League, whose membership embraces some of these high and influential naval officers, inclosing data from the said United States Naval Institute. This propaganda comes from high officers in the United States Navy—admirals, rear admirals, captains, and commanders—because some of each of them belong to this Navy League of the United States, and to said United States Naval Institute. And opposing the policy of their Commander in Chief, these high naval officers, hoping thereby to induce us to give them millions of dollars of the people's money to spend, make scare-head representations to us, which are not at all in accord with the facts the President of the United States has represented to us to exist. Here is this insidious letter from this naval officers' organization:

NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES,
(INCORPORATED 1903)
1749 E STREET NW.,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1927.

Hon. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Navy League of the United States believes that the present omission of the appropriation for the last of the three light cruisers authorized in 1924 means that Congress must now choose between our accepted naval policy consequent from the Washington conference and no naval policy at all.

Consequently we have prepared the inclosed paper so that the reading public may form an opinion on this question from the facts.

The article shows:

(1) At the Washington conference in 1921 America proposed a certain tonnage in surface-auxiliary war vessels as a ratio with capital ships. This, though not accepted as a limitation, was undisputed as a ratio. The British Empire, since the conference, has maintained but not exceeded that ratio in relation to her capital ships. Japan is not building fully up to that balance.

(2) The United States, now underequipped in cruisers, will fall more and more below the ratio for surface auxiliaries as its large destroyer flotilla becomes obsolete; and by the summer of 1931 will be far behind England and Japan unless construction of light cruisers be immediately accelerated.

(3) The United States is obliged by treaty to call a naval conference in the same year of 1931. If no additional ships are now appropriated for by any of the signatory powers, the United States at that time will have 1.88 tons of cruisers to 5 tons for Great Britain and 2.35 tons for Japan.

(4) In 1921 the American proposal to limit capital ships according to the useful tonnages then afloat was adopted. In 1931 the United States can not make or accept such a proposal for surface auxiliaries.

Mere authorization is mere delay, and a decision to delay is a decision against our accepted naval policy of maintaining relative treaty strength in total tonnages and in all types.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER BRUCE HOWE, President.

But this bunch of high naval officers who belong to this Navy League of the United States did not stop in their disloyal fight to set aside the policy of their Commander in Chief—the President of the United States—by merely sending us this propaganda letter, but on this early morning of this January 7, 1927, preceding our vote to-day on these propositions, they also sent us this whole sheet, the size of one page of our daily newspapers, covered with their specially prepared propaganda dope that they prepared for newspapers to use as editorials and news items to influence, first, our own minds by sending it to us on the morning of this day when we vote; and second, to influence the minds of the public when it appears hereafter in their "big navy" propaganda newspapers. Let me call attention to their heading so you will note that it is not released to newspapers until to-morrow, January 8, 1927, the day after they hope we have already done their bidding. Here is their notice authorizing release:

For release in morning papers, Saturday, January 8, 1927—from the Navy League of the United States, 1749 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

And here is their insidious heading of this propaganda specially prepared for newspapers:

Washington conference naval policy jeopardized.

They meant that it is "jeopardized" if we withheld from them these millions they want us to give them to spend. Just the opposite is true, for such naval policy would be jeopardized, and our honor with it, if we built these cruisers after we had agreed on disarmament.

Here is one excerpt from their prepared article under the subhead "Press Supports":

Incidentally, the current discussions about cruisers has recently brought into the office of the Navy League editorial comment from daily newspapers in all parts of the country, and aggregating over 8,000,000 in circulation, approving effective cruiser building, while the editorials opposing it, or neutral, come from papers with an aggregate circulation of less than one and a half million.

Of course they get such reaction from their own controlled newspapers when they prepare and send them to publish these propaganda articles.

And concerning the eight cruisers they are demanding Congress to give them, they say:

Initial "appropriations" have been made for five of them—the keels for two of these were laid last October and the contracts for three of these five have not yet been let! But that leaves three cruisers the "authorization" for which will lapse unless the President undertakes their construction prior to July 1, 1927; and he abstained from asking any "appropriation" for them in the current Budget.

Now, how these naval officers criticize their Commander in Chief, for the "he" in the above is their President of the United States.

And in direct opposition to the policy of President Coolidge—their Commander in Chief—they seek to present to us Congressmen their own policy as follows:

With regard to these three cruisers long since "authorized," it is absolutely essential that a bill be passed by Congress making, first, an initial appropriation for each of them of, say, \$200,000, to be immediately available so that their construction may be started before next July; and second, a further appropriation of \$4,800,000 should be made for each so that their construction can be carried on effectively during the fiscal year that will begin next July. That will give us 8 cruisers building out of the total increment of 26 needed.

The bill introduced December 18, 1926, by Chairman BUTLER, of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, merely "authorized" 10 cruisers, to be built perhaps at some future date, should be amended to "authorize" 18 cruisers, thus making up the total quota of 26 needed; and such initial appropriations should be made as will permit the construction and completion of those cruisers in conformity with our needs and approved naval policy.

It is the President of the United States and not these naval officers who determines "our needs" and who presents to Congress our "approved naval policy" for confirmation.

Who is the President of the United States when he stands in their way? Who is their naval Commander in Chief when these high and mighty naval officers want something he will not give them? Nothing! Absolutely nothing. Away with him, is their cry.

And this special propaganda these naval officers have prepared and sent us on the morning of January 7, 1927, but which is marked for release to newspapers on the morning of to-morrow, January 8, 1927, is signed:

Navy League of the United States. By Walter Bruce Howe, president.

They have asked you to throw aside the policy and the recommendation of their Commander in Chief. They have asked you to disregard what the President says, and they have asked you to do what they want done, to build them three more cruisers, if you please, in spite of the President.

Ah, I have just attended a naval hearing this morning before a naval board in the United States Department of the Navy where a perfectly sane and intelligent lieutenant commander of the Navy has been railroaded into St. Elizabeths Hospital and is being tried before higher naval officers as a man of unsound mind simply because, forsooth, he so far forgot himself that he wrote a letter to the President of the United States appealing to him for a fair deal, and because in response to invited questions to bring out that fact he criticized some policies of the Navy and made to them some wise suggestions.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to his amendment, which is to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; this paragraph is on the Naval Academy, which produces some of these hard-boiled naval officers.

Mr. KING. We are now out of the Navy and in St. Elizabeths Hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more in order to show the gentleman from Illinois there is a proper connection.

Mr. BRITTEN. With what?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, for instance, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who knows more than the President of the United States.

Mr. BRITTEN. About what?

Mr. BLANTON. About everything. That is what the gentleman from Illinois intimated—that he knew more than the President did about naval affairs, when the President has access to every naval institution in the world for his information.

Mr. BRITTEN. But which he does not use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I am one of those American citizens, though a Democrat, who is willing to follow a Republican President when he is right and lays down a proper doctrine of policy for the American people.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I want first to make my connection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Just in line with the gentleman's remarks. I will get the gentleman another minute.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will get me more time I will yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman says that notwithstanding the fact that he is a Democrat he is always willing to follow a Republican President.

Mr. BLANTON. When he is right.

Mr. BRITTEN. But I notice the gentleman is always willing to follow a Republican President when he is wrong.

Mr. BLANTON. If I were to do that I would be following him most of the time; but in this instance, when I know he is right, I say I am willing to follow a Republican President when he is right. Now, this paragraph relates to the United States Naval Academy, and it is responsible for the infernal system of hard-boiled naval officers which now exists, who override everything and everybody to get what they want. The fact is that a man must come through the United States Naval Academy if he would have any standing in the Naval Establishment. But this poor lieutenant commander worked his way up from the ranks, if you please. He came from a Georgia farm and worked his way all the way up by examinations, and he went across the water 20 times with our soldiers in the recent war; but because he did not come from the United States Naval Academy, and because automatically they must promote him next month, they are getting him out of the way and trying to put him in this insane asylum for life—though he is sane—and I am going to show them up when they do it.

When, in this hearing this morning, after they had contended that Lieut. Commander Harry P. Sandlin, of Georgia, is insane simply because he dared suggest policies—sane though they were—not in accord with the policies of his superior officers, I presented this letter and propaganda these high

naval officers sent us to influence us against the policies of their President and Commander in Chief; and this hard-boiled naval board ruled it out and would not let it go in evidence because they knew it convicted them of worse action than Sandlin was guilty of; so they ruled it out. But I am going to show them up when they get Sandlin.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order—
Mr. BLANTON. I am through, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the motion to strike out the paragraph will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For forage and stabling of public animals and the authorized number of officers' horses, \$40,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have not had anything to say about this naval program because I am not an expert and I do not know anything about the expert matters of war. I voted yesterday against the increased appropriation that the committee voted for.

I understand there will be a move this morning to increase the number of cruisers, contrary to the wishes of the President and the Bureau of the Budget. I am going to vote against that increase. I could not justify my position in this House in voting to arm the head of the Army and the Navy with a lot of ships and a lot of war paraphernalia when he says he does not want them and when he says he does not need them.

The thing I can not understand in this situation is that the Republican leadership, who are supposed to be sustaining the President in his economy program, are here undertaking to put a war scare before us and saying that we should vote many millions of dollars and start a program to build a lot of cruisers that in a few months we are going to take out and sink in the Atlantic Ocean. I want somebody to explain that to me. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman said the President has stated he did not want these cruisers.

Mr. ABERNETHY. He says so now and he said so through the chairman of the subcommittee, but the majority of the leaders of the House say he does want them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to what the President did say in respect of telling you what your duties are, as well as the duties of other Members of this House. Here is what he said in his message:

The amount and kind of our military equipment is preeminently a question for the decision of the Congress, after giving due consideration to the advice of military experts and the available public revenue.

So the President puts it up to the Congress to determine what kind of defense we shall maintain.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If the gentleman from Idaho, the chairman of the subcommittee, is to be believed, and he is a man in whom we all have the utmost confidence, the President does not want us to vote any more money than the subcommittee has recommended. And what sort of position is the House putting itself in when we are all talking about economy and when they have declined to allow us to reduce taxes, but are taking this surplus that is in the Treasury and proposing now that we go ahead and vote it out in the interest of certain interests in the country, and then in a few months or in a year or two years we will have another disarmament conference and go out and sink the whole lot in the sea?

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. Does the gentleman follow the President on the question of the tariff?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not.

Mr. GILBERT and Mr. LAGUARDIA rose.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield first to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GILBERT. The reason I can not is because I can not assume the responsibility of risking lives to save dollars, when the experts say we need them.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The experts do not say so. There is no greater expert on naval affairs in the House than my friend from Idaho, and he says we do not need them.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will.

Mr. BLACK of New York. At the first session of Congress the gentleman said we did need them.

Mr. ABERNETHY. He does not say so now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And if the gentleman will permit, the gentleman from Idaho, in 1924, voted to authorize eight.

Mr. ABERNETHY. He did, but now the gentleman says we do not need them. It is all a lot of bunk to say we do need them and to ask us to vote \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 for something that the President of the United States says we do not need and something that the Bureau of the Budget says we do not need, and I can not understand why the leadership on the Republican side of the House is trying to force this through.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman give to the House the name of any naval expert in the world who says we do not need these cruisers?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Calvin Coolidge. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. He is not a naval expert.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALTERATIONS TO NAVAL VESSELS

Major alterations, naval vessels: Toward the installation of additional protection against submarine attack, the installation of anti-air-attack deck protection, and the conversion to oil burning of the United States ships *New York*, *Utah*, *Texas*, *Florida*, *Arkansas*, and *Wyoming*, and for the purchase, manufacture, and installation of new fire-control systems for the *New York* and *Texas*, all as authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize alterations to certain naval vessels and to provide for the construction of additional vessels," approved December 18, 1924, and, in addition, the installation of improved appliances for launching and handling airplanes on the six battleships above named as authorized by the act approved May 27, 1926, \$2,210,000, to be available until expended.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, in the report of the committee, which is available to all Members of the House, when the committee referred to transferred men who have served 16 years or 20 years in the Navy and who have been transferred to the Fleet reserve, we made this statement:

The committee can not state with accuracy but believes investigation will disclose that many of these transferred (virtually retired) men served their entire enlistment in clerical capacities, i. e., in ratings calling for the performance of duties of a clerical nature. It suggests further consideration of the legislation touching the Naval Reserves with the view to confining its benefits to men in those ratings which it is apparent it would be difficult to fill in time of emergency.

Since the publication of the report I have received a letter from Mr. C. E. Lofgren, the director of organization of the Fleet Reserve Association, protesting against the statement and indicating that in his judgment the statement is altogether too wide. In the letter, however, from Mr. Lofgren, he makes the statement that had the committee touched on this question during the hearings, investigation would have disclosed that only about 4 per cent of the transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve hold clerical ratings, leaving approximately 96 per cent in mechanical, technical, and line petty officer ratings and other important and necessary specialties.

May I say that in the bill we are providing, as we must provide—the committee has no election in the matter—for pay for 4,904 16-year men and 3,326 of the 20-year men. In other words, we are providing for a total of 8,230 men.

If the statement of Mr. Lofgren is correct—and we surmise that it is correct—it means that 4 per cent of that number—that is, 4 per cent of upward of 8,200 men—are men who have entered the fleet reserve and are therefore drawing the pay to which they are entitled upon the basis of service rendered in clerical capacity. Four per cent of 8,000 would be 320. This is a rather considerable number and justifies the committee in directing the attention of the House to the matter.

There is no such provision as this in the Army. We are seeking to do nothing to disturb the matter so far as it pertains to those men in the Navy of 16-year or 20-year periods of service. The 16-year period has been discontinued except to those already in the service. We are directing the attention of the House to a situation that does not obtain in the Army, and under which, according to the statement of Mr. Lofgren, director of the organization of the Fleet Reserve Association, there are apparently to-day some 300 men who have attained the retired rating on the basis of clerical service rendered to the Government. It occurred to the committee that, while reporting legislation is outside of our jurisdiction, the House ought to have the matter called to its attention, because I do not think

you want to provide a situation here in regard to what amounts to retirement pay that will be so much greater in the clerical group of employees than you have provided for the clerical retirements that obtain in regard to the rest of the clerical employees of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. The members of the committee recognize the tremendous importance of the service rendered by the bulk of the men who are now members of the fleet reserve. We are not seeking to disturb that, but there is criticism in the Congress because we are carrying on the rolls, according to their own statement, several hundred men who obtained the rating because of clerical service only in the Navy Department. Possibly we should do so. At any rate we hope the matter can receive proper attention, so that the question can be worked out in a way that those who deserve to do so shall receive the retirement in the future to which they are entitled, secure in their position, removing them from criticism; and at the same time that will not do an injustice to the great body of civilian employees of the Government when it comes their time to retire under the law that Congress has enacted.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have a minute more to answer a question. Will the gentleman advise us whether there was a motion made by him or was he proceeding by unanimous consent?

Mr. FRENCH. I was proceeding by unanimous consent; there is no motion pending.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Speaking as one who has served in this Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, and who was serving in that reserve at the time I was called for duty in the last war, I want to say to-day, because if the question comes up next year I shall not, to my sorrow, be here to enlighten the House, that the men who go into the Marine Corps have no control over whether they are to be assigned as clerks or as machine gunners. Since they have lost their volition in the matter, it would be a mistake to say that the man who is assigned to clerical work loses the benefit of that same retirement aid that the Fleet Reserve gives his brother at arms.

In addition to that, having seen the immense value of the work done by many trained clerks who wore out their hearts at embarkation camps seeing that the men got started overseas in war time not because they wanted to go to work but because their conception of duty was to go where they were told to go and do what they were told to do, even though it be clerical work or any other, I for one would not want to put them in a class less patriotic than the man who was a machine gunner. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, \$13,750,000, and, in addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make transfers during the fiscal year 1928 from the naval supply account fund to this appropriation of sums aggregating \$5,115,000, and the total sum hereby made available shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation imposed in the Navy Department and naval service appropriation act, fiscal year 1925, on construction and machinery expenditures on account of one fleet submarine (mine-laying type) is increased to \$5,600,000.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 13, after the word "expended," insert the following: "On account of hulls, outfits, machinery, armor, and armament for three scout cruisers heretofore authorized, \$3,000,000."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment just offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment by Mr. TILSON: Page 51, line 8, under the head "Increase of the Navy," strike out the figures \$13,750,000 and substitute therefor the following: "Fourteen million two hundred thousand dollars, of which sum \$450,000 shall be immediately available toward the construction of the last three of the eight scout cruisers authorized by section 2 of the act of December 18, 1924."

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] is not a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK]. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York came at the end of the word "expended," in line 13. As I understood the reading of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, it is in no sense a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from New York is in effect to increase the appropriation made for beginning the construction of three cruisers. My amendment, by way of substitute, is to strike out the entire amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and to put in its place the appropriation of \$450,000, with certain additional language.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, that is not the language of the substitute that has been sent to the Chair. That may be the purpose of it, but the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York comes at an entirely different place.

Mr. TILSON. It is in the same paragraph.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. It is in the same paragraph.

Mr. TILSON. And performs the same function.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. But it is not at the same place in the bill and is in no sense a substitute.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no question as to whether or not this is a substitute, I ask unanimous consent to change the language of my amendment so that, on page 51, line 8, the sum of \$13,750,000 shall be stricken out and the sum of \$16,750,000 inserted in its place, with the language contained in my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: On page 51, line 8, strike out "\$13,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$16,750,000, including on account of hulls, outfits, machinery, armor, and armament for three scout cruisers heretofore authorized, \$3,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. To which the gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the Clerk will again report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TILSON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: On page 51, line 8, under the heading, "Increase of the Navy," strike out the figures "\$13,750,000" and substitute therefor the following:

"\$14,200,000, of which sum \$450,000 shall be immediately available toward the construction of the last three of the eight scout cruisers authorized by section 2 of the act approved December 18, 1924."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas care to argue the point of order now?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to argue the point of order. I think the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so holds. Does the gentleman from New York desire to proceed?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, if it is the proper procedure, and I understand it is, unless the gentleman from Connecticut desires me to proceed at this time, I suggest that he proceed.

Mr. TILSON. I shall proceed, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRITTEN. The first vote to be taken on the amendments pending will be taken upon the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the first vote would be upon the substitute.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the United States entered into the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armaments in good faith and in the same spirit entered into the agreement growing out of that conference. I believe it to be the desire and the purpose of the American people that we should scrupulously observe that agreement just as it is their desire that we should observe all the other obligations into which this country shall ever enter. What we claim for ourselves we should concede to others, and I am not willing to charge or insinuate that any other nation of the world is failing to live up to its agreement in connection with this matter.

Within the terms of the Washington conference agreement, we have gone forward with our naval program in the construction of what we believe to be a Navy adequate for the purposes for which this country needs a Navy. Of course, there is a wide divergence of opinion as to how rapidly we should go forward. Many think that we should immediately go forward with a very large program, while others would be willing that we should go forward very slowly or not at all. I believe the general consensus of opinion of the people of America to be that we should go forward in a sane and orderly manner and in the end that our Navy should be adequate for the purposes for which a Navy is maintained. The President is for such a Navy, as he has made very clear in his Budget message, and I believe that the country is backing him in maintaining this kind of a Navy.

What is the situation confronting us? The President in his Budget message made clear that it was the purpose of this country to go forward with our cruiser program. In view of the five cruisers still incomplete and of the two airplane carriers nearing completion, it was the recommendation of the Budget message that no appropriation be made this year for beginning the construction of the three additional cruisers. In the very next sentence of the Budget message, however, it recommends the authorization by legislation of these same three cruisers which, without an appropriation or without legislation, would expire on June 30 of this present year.

The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] proposes a substantial appropriation of \$3,000,000 toward the construction of the three cruisers heretofore authorized. Many gentlemen have expressed a desire to make even a larger appropriation in this bill. My substitute amendment proposes a much smaller appropriation toward the construction of these three additional cruisers. The immediate effect of this small appropriation will be to extend the life of the authorization, the very thing which the Budget message of the President suggests be done by legislation. The other effect of this amendment will be that plans and specifications for these three cruisers may be begun. In the long run if the cruisers are to be built—and they will be built unless we enter into further agreements as the result of other limitation conferences—it will cost no more to begin their construction this year than if we wait until next year before beginning.

Mr. SPEAKS. Does the gentleman care to be interrupted?

Mr. TILSON. I yield.

Mr. SPEAKS. I want to inquire whether the authorization can not be continued without in anywise disarranging the Budget program or the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. TILSON. The authorization can by legislation be extended, but a small appropriation in this bill will serve the same purpose as an act of Congress in extending the authorization.

Mr. SPEAKS. But in addition to extending the authorization this implies an intention to continue the building program contrary to the sentiment of the country and to the spirit of the disarmament conference.

Mr. TILSON. Yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. I ask that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Let me answer first the gentleman from Ohio. It does imply an intention to go forward with the construction, but with the limitation which is now in the law that in case of negotiations looking to a limitation of armament the President is authorized to stop construction at any time.

Mr. SPEAKS. I ask the gentleman whether it is fair to our people and to our traditional policy of peaceful relations with all nations to enter upon an aggressive naval construction program in the face of the fact that the nations of the world without exception are endeavoring to reduce armaments and expenditures for military and naval purposes and to respect and conform to the disarmament-treaty program.

Mr. TILSON. My answer to that is that there is no intent or purpose shown by this bill or by the proposed amendment to increase our activities in the direction of building a Navy, but rather to continue to go forward with our program in an orderly way. It is my own view that if this appropriation is made here—and it is a very small appropriation—it will not indicate at all what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. SPEAKS. If the gentleman has no intention to create apprehension among the nations of the world in this respect why not agree to a continuance of the authorization without

appropriating money which on its face belies a disarmament attitude of mind.

Mr. TILSON. If a large appropriation were made here for the immediate construction of these vessels and it was the intention to go forward to the immediate construction of these vessels within the present year there might be something in the contention of the gentleman from Ohio, but there is no such intention or indication here. This small appropriation will serve the same purpose as an act of this Congress extending the authorization for these cruisers.

Mr. BYRNS. I want to say to the gentleman I intend to vote for the substitute amendment, but I desire to ask the gentleman this question: The gentleman has referred to the President's Budget message. The gentleman, we are told, has been in conference with the President. Are we to understand the President has no objection to the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, or does he stand by what he said, that this appropriation ought to be deferred?

Mr. TILSON. There is no reason to believe the President has changed his attitude in the slightest degree from what he stated in the Budget message. The President has made himself clear and there is no reason to assume that the President has changed his attitude, and I do not believe that he has.

Mr. BYRNS. If it be true—and I did not understand very clearly from the gentleman's statement just what the President's position is now—but if it was true that he has no objection to this amendment, I was going to suggest it ought to have come here by way of a supplemental estimate from the Budget.

Mr. TILSON. There was no intention on my part—quite the opposite—to state that the President agrees with or approves of this amendment. The President has made himself clear on the subject, and I believe that my substitute amendment effects substantially what the President proposes in his message when he recommends the authorization by legislation of these three additional cruisers.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Our distinguished leader, in replying to a question from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS], rather inferred that his amendment is simply a gesture as to the construction of these ships.

Mr. TILSON. Not at all.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman desire to convey the impression to the country that we are not in earnest in the construction of these ships?

Mr. TILSON. Even if my amendment be rejected we shall probably go ahead and carry out the recommendation of the Budget message by an act of Congress extending the authorization for the building of these three cruisers.

Mr. BRITTEN. And notwithstanding the President's letter, the House is desirous of proceeding with this construction at once?

Mr. TILSON. The orderly construction of our Navy is going forward and will continue to go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut may have two minutes more, so that he may answer a question from me.

Mr. TILSON. I am willing to answer any question propounded by the gentleman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut desire any extension of time?

Mr. TILSON. I am willing to answer any question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As I understand it, the difference between the gentleman's amendment and that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] is that the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut is merely for the purpose of extending the time for authorization.

Mr. TILSON. And that the plans may be made.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; whereas the amendment of the gentleman from New York, increasing the amount to \$3,000,000, is for the purpose of going ahead with the work. That is the distinction?

Mr. TILSON. To go more rapidly ahead than I think we should go. If we accepted the amendment of the gentleman from New York I think it might be construed as an indication that we are spurting ahead with our program, going beyond an orderly progress in the enlargement of our Navy. The small

appropriation proposed by me does not in any manner affect the orderly construction of our Navy or its progress.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Do you not think your amendment to extend the authorization is rather an attempt to fool the people with the idea that we are building these ships?

Mr. TILSON. No. I think it will merely carry to the people the impression that Congress is determined that our naval program shall continue to go forward in an orderly manner.

Mr. WEFALD and Mr. VINSON of Georgia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TILSON. I ought to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. I shall ask him to please make his question brief.

Mr. WEFALD. Under the Constitution, is not the President the Commander in Chief of the Navy?

Mr. TILSON. He is.

Mr. WEFALD. And if other countries want to enter into competitive armaments, should he not know exactly what the country needed?

Mr. TILSON. The President is performing his duties conscientiously and well. If this amendment be adopted, instead of violating, we are in fact and in deed carrying forward the policy of the administration, as shown in the very paragraph of the Budget message to which I have referred. [Applause.]

Mr. WEFALD. The gentleman is not in harmony with the President?

Mr. TILSON. I am.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SPEAKS] asked the gentleman from Connecticut a little while ago if he thought it would be fair to the other nations of the world to carry out this proposal and build these three cruisers. Is it not a fact that the other nations which agreed to the 5-5-3 naval program have been building cruisers?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. I suppose they are going forward with their navies as we are with ours. I do not think any other nation would be apt to draw an unwarranted conclusion from the fact that we are ready to begin work on these three cruisers already authorized.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. In the judgment of the gentleman, is it necessary that we should continue the authorization, or is that language already in this bill authorizing the building of these cruisers? I am asking for information upon that point generally.

Mr. TILSON. The particular language in the law authorizing these cruisers is such that unless the appropriation is made for beginning their construction the authorization will lapse on June 30 next.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. SPEAKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

Mr. TILSON. I am through with my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that in the discussion under the five-minute rule the Members will be recognized for and against?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Chair will recognize the leader of the minority at this time. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] [applause], and I congratulate him upon offering it.

In order that the situation may be made perfectly clear, it is perhaps proper that we discuss for a moment some elements that, generally speaking, I should hardly think would have any necessary or even proper place in the discussion, and one of them is the question of the attitude of the President of the United States toward this particular matter. I think it is quite clear that it is the primary duty of the Congress to determine the policy in national defense, but it is not improper that the President should be consulted, as his is a primary duty in diplomatic negotiations.

The debate which we have had has been very interesting, and it is quite interesting to see the break, because it is a break, between the President of the United States and the majority floor leader of the House of Representatives. That is true if the President meant what he said in his Budget message and in his subsequent letter to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. Here is the exact language of the President in his Budget message:

While on the subject of our national defense it is proper to state that no provision is made in the estimates for the Navy Department for commencing the construction of the remaining three of the eight light cruisers which the act of December 18, 1924, authorizes to be undertaken prior to July 1, 1927. This country is now engaged in negotiations to broaden our existing treaties with the great powers which deal with the elimination of competition in naval armaments. I feel that it would be unfortunate at this time and not in keeping with our attitude toward these negotiations to commence the construction of these three cruisers. Rather do I recommend to the Congress the enactment of legislation which will extend the time for beginning their construction.

Of course, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is not in accord with that recommendation but is directly contrary to it. Nevertheless, I think the gentleman did right to offer the amendment, and it shall have my support.

For the benefit of gentlemen upon that side of the Chamber who may feel some embarrassment in casting their vote upon this matter on account of the expressed attitude of the President of the United States, reiterated in his letter to the gentleman from Idaho, and for the comfort and consolation of those who may be somewhat in doubt, I venture to read from the Republican platform of 1924. Under the head of "Army and Navy" that platform said:

We pledge ourselves to round out and maintain the Navy to the full strength provided the United States by the letter and spirit of the Conference on Limitation of Armament.

So that the gentleman from Connecticut, when chided with breaking with the White House, can plant himself firmly upon the ground of the Republican platform, as can all my Republican friends who follow to-day the leadership of the gentleman from Connecticut instead of listening to the infrequent voice from the White House. [Applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I should like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And they can point to the fact that the President of the United States is in position to say, as did the soldier, that all with whom he is marching are out of step except himself.

I said a while ago that this debate had been interesting, and it certainly has. I well recall, Mr. Chairman, that November morning in 1921, when the Conference on Limitation of Armament assembled down in the beautiful hall of the Pan American Building. The fortunes of the Republican Party at that time were at a pretty low ebb. They were despondent and in gloom. We all went down upon that occasion and listened to the addresses made, and I well remember that upon our return to this Hall the spirits of our Republican friends had apparently risen. They had cheered to the echo the utterances of the President of the United States and the utterances of the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes. They stood by—and they had in that the aid of most of the Democrats—the contracts which were entered into at that conference, and in the platform of 1924 they made that one of the leading propositions upon which to go before the country and make an appeal for a continuance of power. They said, among other things, under the head of "Foreign relations":

The first conference of great powers in Washington, called by President Harding, accomplished the limitation of armament and the readjustment of the relations of the powers interested in the Far East. The conference resulted in an agreement to reduce armaments, relieve the nations involved from the great burdens of taxation arising from the competitive construction and manufacture of capital battleships, assured a new, broader, and better understanding in the Far East, brought the promise of peace in the region of the Pacific, and formally adopted the policy of the open door for trade and commerce in the great markets of the Far East.

All that as a result of the Conference on Limitation of Armament. Therefore it was quite interesting during the last few days, and within just a little more than two years since that utterance of the platform, to hear various gentlemen on the Republican side admit, aye, with considerable vehemence, assert, that the Conference on Limitation of Armament had proven for our country a delusion and a snare, and the natural logic of their assertions was that it was an extremely unfortunate thing that it was ever held here or anywhere in the world.

Independent of all those things it has seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to maintain a Navy, the first line of

national defense, as great as that which we have the right to maintain under the provisions of the treaty. [Applause.] In so doing surely we can affront no other nation. I do not see how it is possible that by taking action looking toward that end we in any way embarrass any diplomatic negotiations that may be pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I shall ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Upon the contrary, it seems to me the assertion of our rights, of our dignity, and of our intention to be prepared for whatever contingency may arise would be helpful in the carrying on of such negotiations. Assuming that the first opinions of the Republican Party, as expressed in their platform as to the efficacy of the limitation of armament conference was correct, who does not know that what was brought about there was brought about because of the fact that this Government had then entered upon a great naval policy? It was because of the program which had been laid down under the leadership of a former President of the United States—Mr. Wilson—and the former Secretary of the Navy—Mr. Daniels. It was because that program had been laid down that the nations of the world were willing to accept the invitation extended on the part of President Harding to sit at a council table and agree to a limitation of their armaments.

It seems to me, from the statements that have been made by various gentlemen, whose information upon this subject is much greater than mine, that instead of making our Navy what we are entitled to make it under the terms of the treaty we have fallen much below it. I understood it was the contemplation of the treaty that we should have a navy, England should have a navy, and Japan a navy, in the relation of 5-5-3, and that we were to be one of the 5. If I understand correctly gentlemen who have laid facts and figures before the House within the last few days, we are more nearly in the position of 3 than we are in the position of 5, and that we are as though mistaking our own position to-day under the terms of that agreement for that of Japan.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPEAKS. Was it not the intention of the disarmament conference to fix a limit beyond which neither signatory nation could go in a naval construction program?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I so understand.

Mr. SPEAKS. In a spirit of fairness to the whole proposition, would it not be fully within the rights of the American Nation for this Congress to abolish our Navy entirely, if we thought it advisable to do so?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It would, undoubtedly; but I wonder if there is a gentleman here who thinks it would be advisable to do so. [Applause.]

Mr. SPEAKS. I do not think that is fairly responsive to my question.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The first part of my answer is—

Mr. SPEAKS. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It would be within the power of the Congress to abolish the Navy entirely.

Mr. SPEAKS. That is all I wish to develop. I want to emphasize the fact that the disarmament conference placed limitations upon the maximum naval strength of nations signing that agreement, but that any of them were at liberty to reduce their armament in any degree.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, that, I think, is well understood by all. There is no controversy over that question. But there is no contention that the construction of these vessels provided under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut in any way whatsoever violates either the spirit or the letter of the Washington conference.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. With pleasure, to the Speaker.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think the gentleman will agree with me that while under the treaty we owe an obligation to the nations participating in the treaty not to exceed the ratio provided, we owe an equally great obligation to the American people to see that we do not go below the ratio. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I concur entirely with the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished Speaker of the House.

I understood when I gave my support to the bill which authorized the construction of these cruisers that it was the purpose, and certainly it was in my mind, that the Congress was to go further and to provide their construction within a reasonable and decent time, and it seems to me that time has come. For this reason I join the gentleman from Connecticut in the revolt against the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA and Mr. BLACK of New York rose.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Should a gentleman who is opposed to the general proposition of the substitute, considered independently, be recognized in preference to a gentleman who is opposed to the substitute as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say that if he had seen the gentleman from New York seeking recognition he would probably have recognized him.

Mr. BLACK of New York. It does not matter now. I just wanted to know the attitude of the Chair for future consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the purpose of the Chair to recognize gentlemen alternately in favor and against the amendment, so far as it is in the power of the Chair to do so.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, it does seem strange that when an occasion presents itself that I can support the Republican administration and the Republican President I find the Republican Party not back of him. So I guess I am doomed to live in a hopeless minority for most of my legislative days.

I believe many gentlemen on the Republican side of the House are doing the President a grave injustice by interpreting his opposition to these cruisers as being based only on the ground of economy. I do not believe that to be the President's opposition. You are taking the one idealistic and beautiful provision of his messages and by your misconstruction you are interpreting it as being an opposition based on sordid materialism. The President's efforts for world peace and his policy for reduction of armament is the one outstanding feature of his administration. [Applause.]

The President, in his message of 1925, said:

While I am a thorough believer in national defense and entirely committed to the policy of adequate preparation, I am just as thoroughly opposed to instigating or participating in a policy of competitive armament.

The most beautiful thought in his whole message! And you are taking that from him. He said, in 1926:

It is true that a cult of disparagement exists, but that candid examination made by the Congress through its various committees has always reassured the country and demonstrated that it is maintaining the most adequate defensive forces in these present years that it has ever supported in time of peace.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In just a moment.

And only a few days ago the President, in a speech at Trenton, N. J., stated:

I do not believe we can advance the policy of peace by a return to the policy of competitive armament. While I favor an adequate Army and Navy, I am opposed to any efforts to militarize the country.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman read the next paragraph in that message?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Get me some more time and I will.

Mr. COYLE. Yes; surely.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] yesterday in commencing his address in support of his amendment referred to the Constitution and to the powers of Congress, but that same Constitution specifically provides, and purposely so, that the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy shall be a civilian, the President; that the heads of the Navy Department and the War Department shall be civilians. That was not accident. It was purposely thus provided to prevent this country becoming militaristic.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In just a moment.

And while we may take the advice of naval experts, if you please, after all, the Navy is the armed agent of Congress, and Congress is not the rubber stamp of the Navy. [Applause.]

Of course, the Navy Department asks for more appropriations, and so does the Department of Agriculture, and so does the Department of Commerce, and so does the Department of Justice. I have no quarrel with the naval experts coming down here and asking for more appropriations. All the departments do that. I have no quarrel with the splendid spirit

that exists in the Naval Affairs Committee of the House. But it is our duty to curtail extravagant plans, to prevent the executive departments from running away from control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to yield for questions or going to take up all the time?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of this House are teaching you who are friends of the farmers. Had the Committee on Agriculture come out here as united as this committee, instead of coming out with three separate bills and being divided among themselves, your farmers back home would have some relief to-day. I have no quarrel with the Naval Affairs Committee at all.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman vote for the bill if we come out with one bill?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Fine.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But you can not come out with one bill, and you know it.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I just wanted to put the gentleman on record.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] comes here and makes a declaration of political independence and pleads for more armament, the administration policy to reduce armaments to the contrary notwithstanding. I wonder if he will be as independent if a real farm relief bill comes out.

Now, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. The gentleman said that by building three additional cruisers we were engaging in an extended competition with other countries. How can the gentleman say that when we are 26 behind Great Britain and 13 behind Japan?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is a fair question. What is happening in London to-day? The navy department is going to the House of Parliament and use exactly the same arguments that gentlemen from the Naval Affairs Committee are using to-day. Japan will pick up the same argument and they will build three more cruisers. If that is not competitive building I do not know what is. That is just the way it starts. It is an easy thing for us with our resources to build more cruisers, but it is a big thing for us to set an example to the world by backing the President in his efforts to secure further reduction of armaments.

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman be good enough to read a paragraph immediately following the one that he read in the President's message, which I have marked.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, yes. But do not forget that the paragraph the gentleman wishes me to read follows a statement in the President's message that recalls the fact that we are spending \$680,000,000 a year for the Army and the Navy, and that, of course, the President—

Mr. COYLE. Read the paragraph.

Mr. LAGUARDIA (reading)—

This general policy should be kept in effect. Here and there temporary changes may be made in the personnel to meet the requirements in other directions.

Well, we have done that.

Attention should be given to submarines, cruisers, and air forces. Particular points may need strengthening, but as a whole our military power is sufficient.

There, I have read it, and I emphasize "our military power is sufficient." Another big mistake you are making in justifying the additional armament is constant expressions of the danger of our being attacked by some foreign country. I have heard military men say, I have heard naval men say, I have heard Members of Congress say, that we are wealthy, that we have all the gold, and that everybody hates us. That is bunk, a lot of pure bunk. You do not hear the State Department say that. Our foreign relations are splendid. There is not the slightest or remotest danger. To listen to the comparisons made here one would believe that Great Britain is ready to declare war; that we are soon going to be attacked.

There is nothing to it, gentlemen. There is no nation in the world that has resources that would warrant starting war with the United States. Do not be deceived. And surely the relations with Great Britain are so cordial, and always will be,

that it is a very poor argument to justify additional cruisers to compare our Navy with hers.

Now, the only difference between the statement of the President and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is this: The authorization would leave the matters in statu quo, so that within two years Congress could commence the construction of the cruisers if it were found necessary. That I doubt very much. The amendment provides for an appropriation which makes possible the immediate construction of the cruisers. How? By letting out the contract. Oh, that is it, gentlemen. Some shipyards now lying idle are going to get the contract, then you are committed to it, and the next year we will have to appropriate millions to finish the cruisers. Yes; millions to complete the cruisers and millions to operate them afterwards. Do the gentlemen realize that the present bill carries appropriations for the Navy for over \$320,000,000? Is that not enough for a Republic at peace with the whole world? I predict that if we keep heeding the alarmists, the "big-Navy men" and the naval officers, the annual cost for the Navy Department will soon reach \$400,000,000. It is out of all proportions to our need. It is contrary to our Government's policy to set an example to the world for the reduction of armament. The approval of either amendment is in direct conflict with the President's desire to force additional disarmament.

The very fact that we can so easily afford to build more warships and refrain from doing so will be the example, the inspiration, and the hope to the world that the days of competitive armament are over and an era of peace before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BRITTEN, Mr. BLACK of New York, and Mr. LINTHICUM rose.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been 30 minutes' debate in favor of the amendment. The Chair wants to be fair, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maryland, who has asked for time in opposition to the Tilson amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, not being an expert on naval affairs I have spent considerable time in listening to the various speeches under general debate and to the arguments made upon the amendments proposed to the bill during the past few days. I believe in an adequate Navy—one sufficiently strong to defend our country against all adversaries; one sufficiently strong to protect the United States and its nationals. [Applause.] In the old days when I first came to Congress, and my good friend and colleague, Mr. Talbot, was on the Naval Affairs Committee, I was known, together with him and others, as one of the big Navy men. [Applause.] To-day, as I have said, I stand for an adequate Navy; a well-rounded Navy, equipped in every particular, and up to the full standard allowed by the disarmament conference in the ratio of 5-5-3.

I gather from what has been said by the experts upon this bill, and from what I can gather from naval reports, our present Navy is not up to this standard; in fact, we are, perhaps, closer to the 3 standard as allowed Japan at that conference than we are to the 5 standard as allowed the United States and England.

I do not desire to vote to-day in any way which may have a tendency to fool the American people. The temperament of this House appears to be overwhelmingly in favor of the construction of three additional cruisers, so much so that the leader of the majority, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has introduced a substitute amendment providing for an additional appropriation of \$450,000 for the purpose, as he says, of continuing the authorization for the building of these cruisers, which would otherwise expire on the 30th day of June next, and for the further purpose, he says, perhaps, of making drawings and specifications for their construction.

It seems to me that the small additional appropriation of \$450,000 toward a construction of three vessels which will eventually cost if constructed \$45,000,000 is a mere gesture and intended merely to satisfy the American public, who I believe are desirous of rounding out our Navy and giving it such ships as are necessary in conformity with the disarmament treaty. I think if we intend to construct these ships then we should appropriate a sufficient sum to begin the work, and for that reason I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK], which provides for an appropriation of \$3,000,000 toward the construction of these three additional cruisers.

We should let the American people know we either intend to build the cruisers or we do not intend to build them. I look upon \$450,000, as provided under the Tilson amendment, as a mere camouflage to mislead the people. Why should we appropriate only \$450,000? The President can either approve of

the expenditure of this \$450,000 and the contracts for the ships, or he can refuse to expend it under the authority given him through previous legislation, which I have mentioned on several occasions. The world is not altogether at peace. China is in a turmoil and civil strife, and warfare exists throughout that 400,000,000 of people. Nicaragua is in revolution and the condition in Mexico, so far as we are concerned, is not definitely known. Why not then appropriate the \$3,000,000 to proceed with the construction, because the President controls the expenditure, whether it be \$450,000 or the \$3,000,000?

If it is found that the disarmament conference which contemplates further reduction of armaments comes to nought, then the President has a sufficient amount under the Black amendment to accomplish something.

On the 4th of March we adjourn, and it is not likely we shall meet again in session until the first Monday in December, as set by the Constitution, I for one am in favor of making an adequate appropriation; nothing can be lost by the addition; if it is not needed it will lay in the Treasury of the United States along with the other \$400,000,000 of surplus at no additional expense to the Government. But if it is needed, it will be available; I shall therefore vote for the Black amendment, and approach as near as I can to my desire and belief in an adequate and well-rounded Navy. I have no desire to violate in any particular the disarmament conference held under President Harding, but I have a very great desire that our Government shall avail itself of all its rights and advantages under the treaty at that time agreed upon.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the amendment is adopted, does not the gentleman know that it will enable the Navy Department between now and June to enter into contracts for the building of the ships?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; they can not spend one dollar without the President's consent.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will enable the Navy to carry out the provision in accordance with the law.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] of the Appropriations Committee, who is as able to interpret the laws as any gentleman in the House, said yesterday that the President could hold up the expenditure of these appropriations under previous legislative authority.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct when certain conditions arise, but is wrong unless they do arise. The act of 1924 provides:

That in the event of an international conference for the limitation of naval armaments, the President is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to suspend in whole or in part any or all alterations or construction authorized in this act.

An international conference must be called before the President would be justified in refusing the expenditures.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We have already authorized the President to appoint certain delegates to a conference in Geneva, to make rules, regulations, and recommendations for a world conference—why we have already proceeded—and whether we appropriate this money or not, it is in the hands of the President. If we are going to do something, we ought not to make a mere gesture of it and appropriate only \$450,000 to carry on construction. We should appropriate enough money to start the work. Either tell the people of this country that you are for an adequate Navy, or, if you propose to stand pat, then do so, but do not make a mere gesture by appropriating \$450,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As I read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], it provides an appropriation to be used toward the construction of the three cruisers, which means that their construction is to be begun, and the total amount necessary to complete the construction will be in the neighborhood of \$45,000,000. That is the sum total as I read his amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And yet with those words authorizing the construction of these vessels you propose under his amendment to appropriate only \$450,000, which will not even pay for the blue prints and the specifications of the battleships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. It is customary, and it has always been customary, for Congress, where an appropriation is not immediately needed, to authorize the beginning of construction of certain public works. If it be true, and I think we are all agreed upon that, that under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] the Navy Department would be authorized to begin construction and make authorizations for the building of these three cruisers, is not the gentleman aware that Congress, being in session in December next, will have ample opportunity to make whatever appropriation may be needed to carry on the contract so made?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not believe when you are going to authorize somebody to do something in giving a mere pittance. If you want an adequate Navy, a rounded-out Navy, I do not think you should appropriate merely \$450,000 to start a work involving \$45,000,000. It is a mere pittance, as I have said.

Mr. BYRNS. But the point is that if we were to appropriate \$3,000,000, it would not be possible to expend it between now and December.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But suppose some emergency should arise? The world is not altogether peaceful at this time. China is not peaceful; Nicaragua is not peaceful; and we do not know anything about what is going on in Mexico. If you give the President \$3,000,000, he can expend it if he wants to. He does not have to expend it unless he wants to. Why make a mere gesture and fool the American people? The gentleman from Connecticut says that he merely wants to continue the authorization and perhaps make some plans and specifications.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman ever know of an instance in all his long legislative career where the beginning was made in any other way than as proposed here by the gentleman from Connecticut? I have voted 30 times in my day for this very thing.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The beginning is all right, but \$450,000 is all wrong.

Mr. BUTLER. We could not use it; it is not possible to do so.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Then let it stay in the Treasury.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman and I vote the same way on this subject, and we have done this always, and why make an exception here?

Mr. LINTHICUM. We have never appropriated so little as \$450,000 toward such a large undertaking. In principle I am still with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. We have never appropriated more than \$150,000 or \$200,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a volume of World Chancelleries, by Edward Price Bell, and dedicated to the memory of Victor Fremont Lawson, former owner and editor in chief of the Chicago Daily News, published within the year, the introduction of which was written by our distinguished President, Calvin Coolidge, about one year ago. I am going to suggest to the House, as one of the distinguished gentlemen on the opposite side of the aisle suggested this morning, let us follow the President in thought, at least, if we can not in suggestion. I ask to have the President's introductory statement read to the House, because I think it will be very illuminating at this particular moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTRODUCTION

By Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America

Humanity, with reference to the danger of war, is to-day in a position different from that which it occupied yesterday. Wars once sprang from varied causes—biological, racial, dynastic, political, commercial, personal. Wars were sought. Wars were planned. Wars were a part of the accepted rationale of organized human life.

Those days, we venture to think, are past. But if they are it does not follow that the danger of war is past. War may be, and doubtless is, less probable than it was. Its real nature, its horror, and unmitigated calamity, are more poignantly and widely realized than they were. Yet so imperfectly do races and nations understand one another, so perplexing are many of their multiplying relationships, so restless are certain forces of evil, so insecure are the psychological bases of peace that humanity truly may be said to live constantly in the shadow of the possibility of war.

Not in war deliberate, but in war accidental, seems to me to lie the principal present peril. We have a world psychology more inflammable, more explosive, than it ought to be. There is tinder about. There are powder mines. Any flying spark is dangerous. Our war with Spain, as we all remember, was precipitated by the sinking of the *Maine*; and the Great War, whatever may have been its antecedents

of history and of rivalry, rushed upon the world out of the Sarajevo assassination. We need fortification against accidents. We need an international mind more stably balanced against sudden shocks.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I maintain, in all sincerity, that the statement just read is as necessary to-day, is as sound to-day, is as convincing to-day as it was in November, 1925, when it was written for this volume of world opinions from every section of the earth and from men of superior position in world thought. World chancelleries will be quoted many times as time goes on. The President says, "In war accidental lies the principal present peril." War accidental!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITTEN. The distinguished leader of the Committee on Appropriations, having in charge this bill, laid stress repeatedly on what business men would do under certain circumstances and conditions. What does a business man do to protect himself against accident—accident by fire, by burglary, or by any other cause? He insures himself; he insures his business. He takes every precaution possible, even at great expense, to avoid loss, destruction, or humiliation. That is the very thing the House should do to-day. Vote to improve the American Navy, whose sole existence is to insure the life of the Nation to which it belongs. Of course, men differ on the question of the definition of the word "adequate." One man at present on the floor of the House would abolish the entire Navy and trust in God for the Nation's protection. There are others who would build a navy so great, so strong, so costly, that it might bankrupt the Treasury. The word "adequate"—

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Not now, please.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Who would he trust in?

Mr. BRITTEN. For national protection against an enemy on earth I would feel secure behind a first-class Navy and put my trust in God. The gentleman's name always sounds good to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Thank you.

Mr. BRITTEN. The word "adequate," my friends, covers a multitude of directions and a million impressions. An adequate navy, from my point of view and the point of view of most of the men who are sitting here to-day, is a navy that would command respect for the government to which it belongs from every nation on earth; and I maintain, my good friends, that the Navy we have to-day does not maintain that respect, because it is not a well-balanced, homogeneous fighting aggregation of the first class.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. For a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if this situation to-day does not remind him of the situation on the floor of the House approximately 10 years ago, when about the same thing was said by our late lamented colleague, Augustus P. Gardner, at the time he was endeavoring to secure an adequate preparation for the late war in which we were engaged?

Mr. BRITTEN. The same conditions prevailed then which the gentleman from South Dakota recalls, as many of us do. We were not prepared, and pacifists said that war was impossible. And let me suggest to you gentlemen on both sides of this aisle, in 1913, 1914, 1915 we did not follow the President. We led him. We led the then Secretary of the Navy. The Congress of the United States did that very thing.

President Wilson said the sparks were flying about us. You gentlemen who have been here as long or longer than I have will recall the famous speech.

Mr. WINGO. You did not follow the President in 1917.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman refers to the declaration of war. No; I did not follow the President in 1917, and I am proud to-day that I was one of 50 or 51 who voted against war for the very reason that we are talking about here to-day. The country was not prepared, and the costly consequences proved it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Made a pretty good job.

Mr. BRITTEN. But at the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of lives and the wasting of thousands of millions of dollars. Who cleared the seas of enemy warships and enemy commerce? The navies of the allied nations cleared the seas. England was prepared on the seas.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You would not think that they cleared them if you consider the last bill we had up here.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, the gentleman does not think that. If the gentleman will ask me a serious question I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman did not entertain those views in 1917, did he?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD very clearly shows my views in 1917, and I have not the slightest apology to offer.

Mr. WINGO. Is that the reason the gentleman gave at that time for not wanting to send our men overseas?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; and, Mr. Chairman, if the House will give me 10 or 15 minutes I will answer the gentleman concerning that matter very fully. But that is 10 years old. Let us talk about conditions of to-day.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman himself raised the question about the views of the dead President.

Mr. BRITTEN. I did not reflect upon the wisdom of the dead President. I regard him and his memory highly, just as the gentleman does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes longer. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, I wonder if it is running in the minds of the leaders this morning of putting a limitation on the time for debate on this subject, or is it the purpose to run indefinitely for the balance of the day? I was wondering if the chairman of the subcommittee had in mind the proposing of a limitation of time for the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. FRENCH. It has been my thought to let the debate on this particular subject, which is of so much interest, run along for the time the Members wish to take to discuss it, and then seek to limit the debate. I notice that every time one speaker concludes several gentlemen are on their feet seeking recognition, and I think it would be a good way to run along in this manner before attempting to limit the time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am just asking the question for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] for five minutes longer? There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. If I am not interrupted, I will confine my remarks entirely to the amendment pending before the House. There are two or three distinct reasons why Members of the House may or may not favor the amendment now pending. The first and probably the most important one is the attitude of the President of the United States. He has suggested that because of an impending conference in Europe construction shall not begin on these vessels which were authorized in 1924. It should be remembered that that conference is composed of 19 nations, among which are nations that have no navy and have no harbors. I have already characterized that conference as a farce, a fake, and a snare. I want you to bear in mind, my good friends, that practically on the very day that the President said we should not appropriate for these three ships already authorized, almost in the next breath he requested the Committee on Naval Affairs to bring before this Congress a bill authorizing 10 additional ships of the same kind. In other words, he said, "Do not appropriate for those already authorized, but authorize 10 more." What has he in mind? A blue-print Navy that will not even withstand the attack of the sunshine, much less a big gun?

The second reason for voting for or against the amendment pending is the matter of economy. I contend that a nation like ours, which can reduce its national debt a thousand millions a year and still lay away another half thousand millions, should not be affected by such a consideration. The use of the word "economy," when it comes to a question of national defense of the country, is a joke and a farce and is simply used to confuse us.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one brief question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is it the gentleman's view that if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] prevails it will insure the laying down of the keels of these cruisers?

Mr. BRITTEN. Ordinarily such an amount as is carried in the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut, \$450,000, for the three ships might be considered reasonable, because it

would care for the preparation of plans and specifications. In this instance the plans and specifications are already drawn. The amount carried in the amendment, I agree with the gentleman, is ridiculously small. It is just a gesture at construction. And I maintain this, that when the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs studies the hearings on this bill they will have something to say to the House and to the country that will probably change those figures. We in the Committee on Naval Affairs on our side of the Capitol may be called into session by our good old friend "Uncle Tom" and determine how much may be necessary to economically proceed with this construction. I maintain that the Members of the House and of the Senate at this particular moment are not fully informed as to how much money should be appropriated to carry on this work.

It is barely possible that the Navy Department can save for the Treasury anywhere from \$3,000,000 to \$6,000,000 if the six cruisers are built at one time rather than going ahead with three as is now contemplated, having advertised for bids for cruisers Nos. 3, 4, and 5, the bids for which will be opened on March 10 of the present year. It is possible that a big concern like the Union Iron Works at San Francisco or the shipyard at Newport News or the yard at Norfolk might be able to reduce their bids something like a million dollars a ship if they could build more than one at a time. My good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] might say they could save \$2,000,000 on a ship. That would mean a saving of \$12,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman misapprehended my question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Take this center aisle and House floor as a shipyard. Usually down in the center there is a great equipment of derricks and mechanical devices that lift the materials in place. It stands to reason that by swinging those derricks both ways we would save in overhead expenses; we might save \$2,000,000 on a ship. If we can save \$12,000,000 to the Treasury, it would be very good business to go ahead with all those six at one time rather than with the three.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Possibly the gentleman misapprehended my question. It was this: If this appropriation for \$450,000 is passed, will it insure the letting of the contracts for these three cruisers?

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes; I am satisfied of that.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The gentleman is of the opinion, however, that if this \$450,000 is appropriated that absolutely commits the Government to the immediate beginning of the construction of the three cruisers, with a total cost of, perhaps, \$45,000,000?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is the value of this particular amendment, of course.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. So the immediate amount, whether it is \$450,000 or \$4,500,000, is not particularly material?

Mr. BRITTEN. My good friend is entirely correct. It specifically provides for the definite construction of those three ships by the Navy Department.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is the gentleman supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] or the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK]?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will support either one of them very gladly.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. In connection with the construction of these ships in an economical manner, the gentleman is aware that there are a number of navy yards in the United States that will bid down to the minimum on these ships?

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes; and they will bid very low at this particular time, too.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. By the authorization of \$450,000 to-day we want to let the Nation know that we are authorizing the expenditure of \$45,000,000?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is entirely correct, and we want to notify the world to that effect, too.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And it is necessary under the authorization act that the contracts be entered into between now and July 1?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I do not admit that that is quite correct, my good friend. While I think it is necessary for the Congress to appropriate for those three ships before July 1 the time of contract is unimportant.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I differ with the gentleman. I insist that they must be undertaken prior to July 1, and therefore the contract must be actually entered into. Under the amendment the money is made available immediately, but the act for 1928 does not carry one cent for the construction of these ships, and therefore you must use the money before July 1, the \$400,000, and a contract must be entered into between now and July 1.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am willing to accept my friend's interpretation of that.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. But the gentleman's judgment is against the correctness of it?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And the gentleman's judgment is exactly right.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All we have at this time is an estimate as to these cruisers; is not that correct?

Mr. BRITTEN. Well, we have a very definite cost estimate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the estimate is no guide to the final cost of the ships?

Mr. BRITTEN. It is quite a good guide; yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. May I read what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says about that?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I can not allow that in my time. Now, Mr. Chairman, proceeding further, let me suggest this: That all of us are for an adequate Navy and none of us wants to violate the spirit of the Washington conference.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. I would like to know what the gentleman considers is the spirit of the Washington conference. Was it not the spirit of disarmament?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; not at all.

Mr. HUDSON. It was not?

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, no.

Mr. HUDSON. I would like to know, then, the gentleman's idea of the spirit of the Washington conference.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will tell the gentleman—

Mr. HUDSON. It was the spirit of disarmament?

Mr. BRITTEN. Not at all. Disarmament did not enter into the subject at all. It was a question of the reduction and limitation of armaments, and that is not disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, is anyone to be permitted to speak against this amendment?

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from New York is against the amendment.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I am against the substitute.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Well, let us see whether he is for it or not.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not think that any Member of this House at this time can afford to be concerned with the politics of this situation. This House is in the position of having the country believe that it is about to live up to its constitutional duty as set forth so convincingly by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] yesterday and build an adequate Navy. Now, I am not concerned about the President's mind on the situation. I make no attempt to interpret the President's mind on this situation, but I say this: We are either going to build a navy or we are not going to build a navy. You are either going to accept my amendment or accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], and then when you go before the people of your districts you will be compelled to show just what you have done in this matter. If you vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut as against mine, you will show the people some blue prints and show them some figures; but if you vote for my amendment as against the Tilson amendment, then you will show something like the pictures of the British cruisers that are now on the high seas.

What is the idea of my amendment and where did I get it? I got it from the report of the Subcommittee on Appropriations

that was handed to the House at the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress, and here is the report:

In addition to carrying forward work on vessels now under way, the Budget proposes and the committee is recommending an appropriation of \$1,200,000 for commencing three more of the eight light cruisers authorized in the act approved December 18, 1924. The committee, notwithstanding, has agreed with the Budget proposal to postpone the commencement of them in the realization that Congress will have convened in regular session well before the time limit imposed in the authorizing act will have expired.

This subcommittee came to this House at the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress and said we needed \$1,200,000 toward additional construction on the three remaining cruisers, and in the deficiency act of 1925 this Congress appropriated \$1,000,000 each for two cruisers. Let me tell you what has happened to those two cruisers. As yet there has been no sign or semblance of a keel laid down for the *Salt Lake City*, and as far as the *Pensacola* is concerned there are only 30 square feet of steel laid in the New York Navy Yard. When the chairman of the subcommittee took this floor and said we had two cruisers building, the chairman of the subcommittee was far away from the facts.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I will yield if the gentleman will try to get me more time.

Mr. FRENCH. I will do that. The gentleman wants to be accurate, and of the two that are proceeding the keel has already been laid down as to one of them, and the other has proceeded so far that the materials are very largely assembled and the keel will probably be laid down most any week.

Mr. BLACK of New York. That is what I said to the gentleman. If you call what they have in the Brooklyn Navy Yard a keel, all right. As I say, they have 30 square feet of keel, with a little inscription on it, and that is about all. That is how far they have gone on the *Pensacola*, and the chairman of the subcommittee has just admitted that what I said is true, that we have not even laid the keel on the *Salt Lake City*.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Surely.

Mr. MILLER. The records of the Navy Department show that the *Pensacola* at the New York Navy Yard is 2.7 per cent completed, and that the *Salt Lake City*, at the Cramps, is 1.5 per cent completed.

Mr. BLACK of New York. All right; I will admit that 30 square feet of steel is 2.7 per cent, but that is far from 100 per cent.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman advise the House where the navy yard is located that he refers to—in whose district?

Mr. BLACK of New York. In New York, in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUAYLE]. What has that to do with it? What has that to do with the merits of the question? [Applause.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I think it has a lot to do with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object; but under my reservation of objection I want to call the Chair's attention to the situation. Not a single speaker yet has been recognized to speak in behalf of the bill. All the speakers have either been in favor of the Tilson amendment or have been in favor of enlarging the Tilson amendment, except the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA]. I insist that the few of us who are backing the President should be heard in behalf of the President's policy on this bill. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is endeavoring to make a speech under a reservation.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the Chair will recognize some of us later.

The CHAIRMAN. It is impossible for the Chair to know what position gentlemen will take. The Chair has thought he was alternating between the various views, but when gentlemen get the floor and the committee itself permits them to proceed 15 or 20 minutes upon an original recognition of 5 minutes, that is not the fault of the chairman.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object to any Member being heard as long as he wants to be heard.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to set aside a certain amount of time to be equally divided between the two official spokesmen of the President, the gentleman from

New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Only in this instance am I backing the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Gentlemen of the committee, the only distinction between my amendment and the Tilson amendment is that I contemplate something real. I would carry out the thought of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I would carry out the thought of the naval experts. My distinguished leader, for whom I have the greatest affection, seems to see a break between the majority leader and the President on this question.

There is just as much of a break between the majority leader and the President on this question as there is between two professional wrestlers under the same management. There is no break between the President and the majority leader on this question. They are both engaged in setting up a device or trick to fool the people of the United States. Europe is fooling the President. The President is fooling the committees of Congress. The committees expect to fool us, and we are expected to fool the people by the Tilson amendment.

When the President gets this bill with the Tilson amendment on it, all he will do is to say, "I regret very much that this amendment has been added, because it interferes with the economy program, but I had to sign it just the same, and I call attention to my alibi letter that I wrote Mr. French, of Idaho."

They are now working together. They do not intend to build a Navy. There is another thing about it. If we need the 10 cruisers that are suggested in the authorization agreed upon by the President and the Naval Affairs Committee, if there is any urgency demanding that, so much the more is there a demand for final construction.

The chairman of the subcommittee the other day said that Japan is not doing much about building a navy. Japan is spending 27 per cent of its budget on a navy. Japan is spending more at the present time on its navy than it ever has.

What is the fundamental cause for all this disturbance? Why do we have to think of building a Navy? What has happened to the country?

Our country should examine its conscience. The magnificent Wilson carried America to the summit of idealism, and, weakened by his superb effort, he saw the Nation torn from his dying clutches, gravitate, attracted by the dark powers at the foot of the mountain. They could not lure him from his eminence, but they have laid the Nation low.

Wilson surrendered the country to a man too great-hearted to be wary. Treachery to him and to the United States exploited his control. His simplicity made of our foreign relations a series of triumphs, for diplomatic swindling, over a normal human being's ingenuousness. Harding for the straws of statecraft transferred our naval supremacy.

Never than to-day has America been in such low estate, in a subjective or objective aspect. High places in Government bartered, the dollar triumphant in our domestic scale, the dollar emblematic before the world. A country without a law, but the law of brass; a country without a voice, but the whine of the miser.

Where Wilson gave the country a heart it now has a purse; where he gave it brains it now has vacuity; and where he gave it power it now has palsy.

May to-day mark a revival in our affairs. May the Congress justify its existence and assume control of the state of the Union. May the Congress in its collective wisdom give the country leadership. May the Congress ignore the piteous plea of the Executive that he alone be preserved.

Our people want this Nation to have the dignity so markedly expressed by power on the sea. It gives us authority abroad and has a psychological reaction favoring authority within our borders.

Make America of maritime competency and see to it, gentlemen, that politics does not assume the bridge and economy haul down the flag. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. In other words, the gentleman from New York is a full-fledged jingo.

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; the gentleman from New York is neither a jingo nor any form or kind of a jingo; the gentleman from New York is a practical common-sense citizen, who has been reading the records and studying the question, and let me ask the gentleman from Texas what is the purpose

of Great Britain in building a great navy and the purpose of Japan in building a great navy? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BURTON. I ask, Mr. Chairman, leave to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I rise to oppose both amendments that are before the committee. [Applause.] At least, I am opposed to the Tilson amendment if it means that which has been said that it means on this floor [applause], namely, that it authorizes or directs the Navy Department to go ahead with plans and to make contracts for the building of these three cruisers. If it were confined merely to extending the authorization after the 1st of July, 1927, I should not object. But under the interpretation which seems to be accepted here, it makes little difference whether \$450,000 is appropriated or \$3,000,000. Both provide for the construction of three cruisers.

One of the main reasons why I am opposed to both of these amendments is the glaring inconsistency between advocacy of a conference for the limitation of armament and at the same time expanding our Navy by the building of three warships [applause] which will cost over \$50,000,000. Bear that expense in mind, but that is a subordinate consideration.

I think the House and the country do not fully comprehend the very wholesome movements toward peace in the world within a little more than a year, and I ask your kind indulgence while I state some of them.

First, the settlement of a bitter controversy between Greece and Bulgaria. Second, the better relations between the powers of Europe and Turkey, now a republic. Third, the admission of Germany to the League of Nations with membership on the council.

Next to that I would mention the rapprochement between Germany and France and the Allies. It is probable that the military occupation of the Rhineland authorized by the Versailles treaty will be very materially curtailed, and it is expected that evacuation will be accomplished. In place of the old-time antagonism existing since 1870 and 1871 there is at least in diplomatic negotiations a friendly spirit manifested between Germany and France. Again, instead of leaving to the council of ambassadors the decision of questions whether Germany has violated the restrictions of the treaty of Versailles, the question is now left to the League of Nations.

Let me add some other things. The army of France has been reduced by 100,000 men, and a proposition is pending which looks to a reduction of from 600,000 to about 400,000, with a very good prospect of success. And most of all is the fact of the Locarno treaties, which look to a new era for the settlement of controversies. They provide that there shall be an effort by arbitration with the concurrence of the machinery of the League of Nations for a settlement of questions. The nation that refuses arbitration on peaceful methods would be regarded as an outlaw.

I wish to say something right here, out of line with this discussion. I trust our country, which has passed laws authorizing the President to forbid the shipment of arms to certain countries, will adopt a policy to this effect—that when a country in Europe has refused arbitration, having agreed to submit to it for the decisions of questions, we shall not aid that country by loans, by the sending of munitions, or food supplies. [Applause.]

There are three great questions intertwined in this question before us—peace, disarmament, and security.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I merely want to ask in regard to the 18 treaties for arbitration of disputes throughout the world that Secretary of State Bryan negotiated. How much good did they do, and what effect did they have upon the European war, which shortly after their negotiation followed?

Mr. BURTON. They were negotiated in 1913. We had no treaty with Germany, but we have not had a war with a single country with which those treaties were made. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman's reply was very good, very courteous, and correct, but what we are considering to-day is the protection of America, and we have no interest whatever in a treaty that might be entered into on the other side of the ocean, between Turkey and Hungary, for instance.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, do not let the nightmare keep you awake at night or stimulate you to talk in the daytime that some-

thing is needed for the protection of America. [Applause.] Who is threatening America? Who dares to threaten America? Why, there has been talk about China and Nicaragua, and when I read this morning about the number of warships we have out in China I think we have enough there already, and we do not need any more. [Applause.] And we have a force sufficient for Nicaragua as well.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURTON. We can not carry on talk contemporaneously. I have the floor. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is quite fair to compare our condition with that of Great Britain, with her far-flung possessions, with the obligation to protect her dominions, and the further fact that she depends for her very life—her food supply, and for raw material—on other countries.

I can very readily conceive that she needs a larger navy than the United States and I do not object to her building a larger number of cruisers than we have. [Applause.] I have always regarded war between the United States and Great Britain as out of the question. [Applause.] I repeat one reason which I have given here once before on this floor. The most prosperous English-speaking dominion of Great Britain is just to the north of us. It is a hostage, if I may use a term not offensively, for Great Britain's good behavior. If there should be war, we would in a month overrun Canada and tear her away, though she be one of the brightest jewels in the British Empire. There is no danger of war there, and we need not be frightened because she has been increasing the number of her cruisers.

I said that three problems were inseparably associated. If there is one crying need in the world to-day it is for an era of peace, that we may recover from the destruction and the woe of the late frightful war. Disarmament is impracticable unless there is some method of security; but that does not mean that we should increase our armament excessively, extravagantly, or in any way beyond our needs.

Security must be obtained through methods for the settlement of controversies. In every international conference that I have attended that idea has been especially stressed by France. She has maintained that she can not disarm or very substantially limit her land forces unless she is assured that she will be protected in case of attack. Very substantial progress has been made along that line by the pacts of Locarno, which I have already mentioned, as well as by other means.

I appeal to you gentlemen who have navy yards in your districts, to you gentlemen who have shipyards in your districts, to look at this problem from the large and not from the local interest, to look at it from the interest of the whole country. [Applause.] Are you going to vote for some tens of millions or more of money because you think perhaps the job will be let in your locality, you of the navy yards? Perhaps the private shipyards will get the better of you and they will get the contract, and vice versa.

Mr. Chairman, I fear there is a militaristic reaction in this country. I do not think it exists in Europe. I think that in Europe there is a very substantial progress toward peaceful methods for the settlement of international controversies. Do not let us step out of line.

It does not lie with us to criticize large appropriations by other countries or mounting military and naval expenses. Our own expenditures for these purposes are larger than those of any other country in the world. Three hundred and twenty-four million dollars is proposed in the pending bill. The amounts carried in recent years in the military appropriation bills have been somewhat larger. I note an estimate by the President that the total amount for the two is \$582,000,000. The only country which compares with that amount is Great Britain, which, according to the latest budget available, provided £45,000,000 for the army, £15,000,000 for the air service, and £60,000,000 for the navy; in all, £120,000,000, or approximately \$581,900,000.

Of course, the larger wages paid in this country and the more generous provision in many ways account for part of this difference, but is it not a grave question whether, if we wish to set an example of peaceful intentions or curtail our own expenditures, we ought not to restrict rather than enlarge the provision made for military and naval activities?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit me to quote, as showing full concurrence with the views which he has very ably expressed, from the speech made by Mr. Root the other night in New York?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In which he says:

For this year the league in the political and the court in the judicial field have been rendering the best service in the cause of peace known to the history of civilization—incomparably the best.

Mr. BURTON. I do not go so far as to favor our joining the League of Nations, though I do favor our joining the World Court. The league is a good thing for Europe, but I do not think we should enter it, at least at present, because it involves us in complications not strictly our own.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. He was speaking of the institution as it now is, without any regard to our going into it.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, a country, like an individual, has a duty to perform. Our country has a duty to perform to our own people in stimulating the spirit of peace. It has a duty to perform to the whole world in preventing as far as possible the terrible ravages and outrages of war; and a proposition of this kind to increase our Navy at this time is sure to grate upon that spirit which looks toward peace, the rising tide, I may say, which promises well for a future, far better than the past. The nations of Europe are exhausted, and, except in the case of minor countries, it is not likely that they will fly at each others' throats, if for no other reason than because of the exhaustion of their resources and the recollection of their terrible sufferings in the late war. They are using supreme efforts to bring about a condition in which their difficulties can be settled amicably.

I was present at Geneva last September and I heard the speeches of Herr Stressemann and M. Briand when Germany was admitted to the league. I witnessed a scene of enthusiasm that I have rarely seen in my life. I can not believe that their words were hypocrisy or camouflage. I rather have the conviction that this meant that both those foreign ministers were sure to labor with might and main for peace between France and Germany, and for the peace of the world.

And shall America lag behind? I do not intend to enter into this controversy as to whether there is a quarrel between the President and the House leaders. I do not desire to enter upon either criticism or defense of the President. To my mind, this problem bulks larger. We are taking the responsibility to-day, a grave responsibility, whether we, as the House of Representatives of the United States, will with our voices, which shall be heard around the globe, exert our efforts in the great cause of justice, peace, and of humanity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURTON. I yield back the remainder of my time. I desire to explain one thing about which there has been a good deal of controversy by inserting in the Record an account of the proceedings of the preliminary commission for disarmament at Geneva. I have made an analysis with some elaboration, and while the commission was not very successful the same has been true in several instances. It was true here in 1921 and 1922:

ACCOUNT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR A DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

In the very recent meeting of the Preparatory Commission for a Disarmament Conference at Geneva, the delegation from the United States took advanced ground. Unfortunately, in the deliberations of this commission, radical differences of opinion have developed. The French, having a conscriptive system, sought to show that the volunteer system was far more effective in preparation for military aggression than the conscriptive system. This inevitably brought together in opposition Germany, England, and the United States as exponents of the volunteer system. At a very early date the French stated that all armaments must be considered as a unit. In other words, it was necessary to consider land, sea, and air armaments in the same manner and at the same time, and, although they were signatory to the Washington treaty for the limitation of naval armaments, they criticized that instrument and denied the possibility of any equitable limit of naval armament based upon tonnage by classes. That is, they favored what is termed the global-tonnage method, under which there should be an enumeration of battleships, cruisers, and all other classes of naval ships.

The American delegation presented for adoption a definition of armaments in this form:

"The organized military (army, navy, and air) forces of a country including trained reserves with their material and installations actually in being."

The French sought to force the adoption of a definition which included the resources of a country, including population, factories, means of transportation, and supplies of coal and of iron. The Dutch went one step farther and sought to include geographical features and meteorological conditions, thus giving rise to a facetious classification to the effect that armaments included "hogs, fogs, and bogs."

Another point of difference was on the subject of trained reserves. The American delegation insisted that such reserves should be included

in comparisons of military strength and also in plans for limitation. The French sought to exclude them from all consideration and sought to include in the peace-time armaments of a country police forces, customs guards, forest guards, etc. A compromise was reached under which the French consented to include trained reserves, but redefined them as including all persons whose technical training was such that they might be of service in the event of a war. According to their contention, this definition includes practically all technically trained parts of the population of a country, irrespective of age or sex, such as the personnel employed by railways, those in the merchant marine, and in factories which produce supplies required in time of war, including clothing, foodstuffs, and shoes, and in personnel, doctors, nurses, electricians, and those who have received a technical education.

Another point of difference which developed was in the advocacy by the French of a rigid international control of disarmament, preferably centered in and exercised by the League of Nations, including a system of inspection. The American delegation insisted that the execution of any international agreement dealing with the limitation or reduction of armaments must be based on international good faith and respect for treaty obligations. In this view the American thesis was supported by a majority of the nations represented, including Italy and Japan.

In the first four months of the meeting of the preparatory commission questions were determined by vote of all the nations. Thus, in propositions relating to naval strength, countries in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, etc., which practically possess no naval tonnage, had equal weight with countries like Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. On the initiative of Mr. Gibson, chairman of the delegation of the United States, a change was agreed upon, under which differing views were presented in parallel columns labeled with the names of the nations which supported them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I ask that the gentleman have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURTON. The technical or preliminary commission did not act with harmony. There were several points of variance, as I have described above. One was on the point of what should constitute armament. They disagreed on another matter rather vital. France asked that there be a commission appointed to supervise the conduct of the different nations and see whether they were observing the terms of any treaty they might make. The United States, in accordance with our traditional policy, opposed that proposition. We have always taken the ground of not desiring espionage in overlooking other nations, but relying upon the good faith of the people with whom we deal and expecting them to adhere to their agreements. To show that differences in the preliminary commission need not discourage us, I will call attention to the conference of 1921 and 1922, where statesmen had to overrule the experts. The same is true of the conference which I myself attended at Geneva for the control of international traffic in arms, and my hope is, though no one can be sure, that when the representatives of the different countries get together their conference will make a tremendous stride for peace in the world, and I do not wish to see my country throwing any stone in the way. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it seems to me that the question which we have here can be stripped of a good many incidents that need not be particularly urged. In the first place, it may be conceded that we are all in favor of an adequate Navy. In the second place, I think we are obliged to concede that if our Navy is now inadequate it would not be much helped by the construction of three additional cruisers and that, therefore, we are not confronted by any serious practical condition in that regard.

I can not avoid thinking that we are obliged to link this discussion with the discussion that took place here just one year ago. On the 4th of January, 1926, the President sent a message to Congress in which he advised the acceptance of an invitation of the League of Nations for this Government to participate in an arms conference, or rather in a preliminary negotiation looking to a disarmament conference, and if you will indulge me for a minute I will read one extract from his message:

The general policy of this Government in favor of disarmament and limitation of armament can not be emphasized too frequently or too strongly. In accordance with that policy any measure having a reasonable tendency to bring about these results should receive our sympathy and support. The conviction that competitive armament will constitute a powerful factor in the promotion of war is more wisely and justifiably held than ever before, and the necessity of lifting the

burden of taxation from the peoples of the world by limiting armaments is becoming daily more imperative.

That was the view of the President as of January 4 of last year, and the House quickly took action in response to his request for an appropriation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Not just now.

On January 16 a resolution was considered here, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, authorizing an appropriation of \$50,000 to enable the President to take part in the proposed Geneva conference, and that resolution was passed on the very day when the naval appropriation bill of last year was taken up, on January 18, 1926, and the President almost at once appointed a commission to represent officially the United States at Geneva, with Mr. Hugh Gibson, the minister to Switzerland, at the head, and officers of the Army and Navy in the membership. And since then those representatives of the United States have been earnestly and actively engaged in the work.

I have here, taken from the newspapers of day before yesterday, a dispatch from New York, stating that Mr. Hugh Gibson was then in New York, and quoting him in substance as saying that the effort to do what is being sought at Geneva is regarded in a friendly light, and almost going to the point of predicting that there will after awhile be a successful conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia have five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Anybody who has faced Mr. Gibson in our Foreign Affairs Committee knows how able he is and how frank he is in the expression of his opinions; and he now states to the country that there is a hopeful situation on the other side with reference to this matter, the tremendous importance of which has just been stressed by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. The dispatch went on to say that Mr. Gibson was on his way to Washington to confer with the President and Secretary of State Kellogg. I have found out by inquiry this morning at the State Department that Mr. Gibson is here now, reporting to his superiors and planning with them what shall be done when the conference resumes its session in March.

And so we come to the particular question upon which the issue is joined. We, of course, know we have the constitutional right to act as the gentleman from Connecticut proposes. It was perfectly superfluous for a gentleman to stress that point yesterday and to say that the Constitution was framed and adopted by Americans. Nobody doubts that. Reference might just as well have been made to the ten commandments and to the fact that they were not adopted by Americans. We can act, but are we going to act in a way to stultify ourselves, after having voted as we did on January 18, 1926, to confide this to the President? Do we now intend to retrace our steps and say to him, "We no longer have any confidence in what you are attempting to do, or to vote to do what is proposed, notwithstanding you advise us that it would put a handicap upon you in successfully carrying out the project upon which we have embarked?" Do we intend to disregard him and to say to him, "Stand aside; we have a constitutional right, and we are going to exercise that right, with indifference as to what your views are or what the consequences may be?"

We can not lose by waiting. But we can lose very much by going forward hastily. There is talk by its advocates about this proposition as a gesture. But it may be regarded by the European nations as gesture of unfriendliness and menace to them. Wherefore, then, should we make such a gesture? Why should we not pause a little? We are not in any danger, because we are not threatened by any government under the sun. Why should we not pause a little until the President can complete what he started to do, if that be humanly possible?

Oh, gentlemen, my friend from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] can not persuade me that he is not at variance with the President. There never was a more acute controversy between Congress and the Executive presented than he has made for us here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Rather than take the honeyed words of the gentleman from Connecticut, I prefer to take the outspoken statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who is quoted in the newspapers as expressing an opinion which is a correct opinion—"If we get these three cruisers, it will be a big victory for us and a rout for the administration." It will be a rout for the administration. But, gentlemen of the committee, I doubt in the end whether it will be a rout for President Coolidge. I believe that in spite of the excitement that has prevailed here, in spite of a sort of recrudescence of military feeling which is manifested here for the moment, I doubt extremely whether the people in the quiet places of this country, the people who are not clamorous, but who slowly form their judgment and express it at the polls—I doubt whether the people of America will approve of the action which is contemplated here now; but whether, on the other hand, they will not approve, as they have often approved, the position of the President of the United States. [Applause.] He may feel now, if this is done, as Voltaire said once, "God deliver me from my friends; I can take care of my enemies." [Applause.] But I think the time will arrive, and within the next two years, when the matter is put to the test, it will be found that he can take care not only of his enemies but of his pretended friends. [Laughter.] In the end he is not the one probably to suffer a rout.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does the gentleman then think that we should suspend naval construction entirely pending the possibilities of this international conference?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No; not entirely, but reasonably. One minute. My distinguished friend says "entirely." Of course not. The gentleman could not have expected me to answer that in the affirmative. But give a little time for the President to act. That is all that those who stand for this bill ask.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Should we withhold completely the development of a perfectly reasonable and orderly program of naval construction?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Those adverbs are very misleading, as is understood by everyone in this House.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. My good friend was quite positive of the President's capability to care for his friends as well as his quondam enemies in the future, or vice versa. Is the gentleman going to follow the President in 1928?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Frankly not. I shall vote for my own party nominee. My distinguished friend, the leader of my party, has read from one party platform. I may say in passing that if party platforms were carried into actual execution we would have a government so absurd as to make the angels weep. [Applause and laughter.] But when we look at the Democratic platform, adopted in that protracted convention in New York—where there are navy yards building ships, by the way—we find that it contained a declaration against this very thing that so many gentlemen are advocating, the competitive building up of navies. It said "an adequate Navy," but it set its face against the competitive building up of navies.

Now, my friend from New York said, "Shall we wait?" A little while ago it was developed in a case tried here in the city of Washington that because certain very honest gentlemen, including the Secretary of the Navy and an admiral of the Navy, in their excitement failed to wait, fearing that they were threatened by Japan, the naval oil reserves of this country were passed by leases out of the control of the Navy into private interests. [Applause.] They could not wait. They were so excited by their fears that they declined to wait.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. They declined to wait. They thought it was all right then that they acted, but what did the people think about it later on, and what are the people going to think about it later on when they come to know of what we do if we pass this amendment, which is so unnecessary and which will bring about a prospective expenditure of something like \$50,000,000?

I am no pacifist. I am an American who believes in all the defense that is necessary for the country at every moment and under every condition, but I hate to see a spirit here such as has been exhibited elsewhere, such as is voiced in the statement to the Italian people by Mussolini, that they must "live dangerously." And, by the way, that statement did not originate with him. I do not believe anybody has called attention to the fact that the statement originated with that evil philosopher of the German people who infected that people with such a passion for aggressive war. It was not first Mussolini but Nietzsche who said, giving voice to a statement which we ought to reprobate and to a spirit which we ought to combat, "Live dangerously. Erect cities beside Vesuvius. Send out your ships to unexplored territory. Live in a state of war."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] now arrays himself against the desire of the President. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] sits on one side of him and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] on the other side of him, both arrayed against the President. I do not question their good faith, but I respectfully question their good judgment and I earnestly hope that this body will reject both of the pending amendments and stand by the administration bill. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the House were now asked what speech during the course of debate on this bill would find warmest response in the minds and hearts of the plain, average American citizens engaged in everyday gainful occupation, what would be your reply? Ah, the spontaneous rising of this body when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] finished his speech answers the question. [Applause.] The force and strength of his speech was not in its logic, though that was fine; was not in its rhetoric, though that was charming; but it was the sentiment expressed and the message which it brought so forcibly to the minds and hearts of those who heard it. That same sentiment prompted this House not long ago to request the President to again assemble the nations of the world for the purpose of seeking a further limitation on armaments, both land and sea, if possible. This House, as I remember, passed the resolution without a dissenting vote, and in doing so we correctly interpreted the earnest desire of our people for peace, for better mutual understandings between the nations of the world, and the lifting of heavy financial burdens imposed by competitive armaments.

Is it surprising then that when the President to whom you had made that request informed our subcommittee that it was his purpose and hope that the nations would, during 1927, come together for the purpose of considering a further limitation of armaments and that because of such a conference expressed the wish that no appropriations would be carried for the three remaining cruisers authorized to be built? Is it surprising, I repeat, that we yielded to the request of the President and failed to recommend any appropriation at this time for such cruisers, even though, as I stated a few days ago, in the absence of this request from the President, the committee would likely have been favorable to an initial appropriation to start construction on these vessels. Please remember that the President's request was simply to defer appropriations until after a further conference on limitations. He did not say that we might not need more cruisers if no results followed from the conference, but if I am permitted to place my interpretation on his request, is it not this, "That the wish of the American people and of Congress for a further limitation of armaments would have consideration during 1927, and that until the nations could confer together on this subject he thought it unwise to carry or to make any appropriation for additional cruisers?"

What sound reason can be advanced why the appropriation for these ships should not be deferred for this short time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be extended for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, an analysis of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr.

TILSON] will clearly show that even if you should pass it that it would not add any ship or even begin the construction of any ship for the Navy during the time that the President has asked that appropriations be deferred.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. RAGON. Did the President, in arriving at this conclusion, have access to all of this naval information from these experts, and did he avail himself of that information?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I assume that the President was fully informed.

Mr. RAGON. Did the subcommittee in the investigation of this matter have any of these naval experts before it when the members of the committee arrived at the unanimous conclusions that they ought to stand by the President's recommendation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; the simple request from the President, the head of our Army and Navy, and on whom was imposed the responsibility of securing a further limitation of armaments, was to our committee sufficient reason to defer this appropriation. Analyze the Tilson amendment and tell me whether it would add during the next fiscal year one iota of strength to the Navy? I assert, without fear of contradiction, that it would not, and yet you would conclude from listening to some of the speeches that have been made that there is now supreme and urgent need that we hurriedly build additional cruisers.

The amount carried in the Tilson amendment is not sufficient to authorize the department to let a contract for the construction of any of the cruisers, and the author of the amendment admitted this when he said that his only purpose in offering the amendment was to carry over the authorization for the building of ships after July, 1927. No one knows better than does the gentleman from Connecticut that there are other and more convenient ways to preserve the authorization without appropriating \$450,000 therefor.

An examination of the records of Congress would fail to show, I am sure, that we ever appropriated for vessels to cost upward of \$50,000,000 any initial amount of less than \$5,000,000. The department will be unable, though it might have the technical right, to let any contract for vessels of this type without many times the amount proposed in the Tilson amendment.

If there be force in the suggestion of some favoring this amendment that they recognize the urgent need of now adding additional cruisers to the Navy, they should in all fairness propose an appropriation for an amount sufficient to start construction. It is the policy of the Navy Department to let no contract for the construction of a ship, unless the amount appropriated therefor is sufficient to continue construction until such time as Congress may consider further appropriation therefor, and \$450,000 will not even be sufficient to begin the construction of a single ship.

I repeat, the author of this amendment confesses that it is not intended to authorize any construction. This House has no desire, I am sure, to mislead the country, and yet in the light of the propaganda carried in the newspapers for the past few weeks, stressing the urgent need of cruisers for the Navy, who doubts that the interpretation placed on any favorable action taken on this meaningless amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, would be that Congress had repudiated the President's request for deferring an appropriation for the construction of cruisers and had authorized such construction to be immediately begun, and had appropriated therefor.

Such an impression here and abroad might seriously interfere with the success of the President in his efforts to secure a further limitation on armaments. Only this morning the action taken by the House on yesterday to provide a small appropriation to start the construction of one lighter-than-air machine—of which we have none—and even though it was stated that this construction was undertaken simply to demonstrate what its possibilities were for over-ocean transportation and for scouting—yet the papers undertook to construe the action of Congress in providing this small appropriation for one airship as a repudiation of the President in connection with the proposed limitation armament conference. It had no connection whatever, as every Member here knows, with the conference on limitation, which the President has in mind for 1927, and to which he referred only in connection with the proposed appropriations for cruisers.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is there not this additional danger that in the event the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is adopted that the department could contract for these cruisers, and in the event further conferences would not require them the Government would be liable under the contracts?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Technically the department might be authorized, with a small appropriation, to let a contract for the construction of the three ships, but under the practice, and it has always been scrupulously followed, the department refuses to make any contract for the construction of vessels until Congress has provided a sufficient appropriation to reasonably carry on construction until Congress can have a further opportunity of providing such funds as may be needed for continuing contracts thereafter. No one will question the assertion that the amount proposed in the Tilson amendment will accomplish nothing whatever, but simply furnish the basis for a possible misunderstanding.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not the gentleman from Alabama differentiates in the granting of a dirigible, when there is a million dollars to spend on helium outside the construction—there is as much a threat toward the peace of the world as granting the cruisers.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Not the slightest threat, and I will say to my friend from Tennessee that I have just explained why. He was probably not in the room at the time.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Are we to understand that the President still adheres to the original recommendation made to the committee? The President was not in favor of the construction of these three cruisers at this time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. He not only made known his wishes to the Bureau of the Budget but also to our committee, and in a note to the chairman of the subcommittee, read from the floor of the House a few days since, he adheres to this request.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. He still adheres thereto?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably so.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. That is the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I ask for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I not in conclusion say to those who feel that there is a disparity in the strength of our Navy with that of other nations and that there is now urgent need to add cruisers, that if in 1922 a treaty was entered into whereby our country scrapped six battle cruisers and seven battleships of speed and armament greater than any other ships of such kind in the world, and also agreed not to fortify any bases west of Hawaii, then surely the mere temporary postponement of appropriation for three small cruisers could not be considered as now menacing our national defense. May we not hope that during 1927 the President may realize the long and fond dream of America for an agreement with the nations whereby naval and land armament will be so limited that no one nation can threaten offensive warfare against another? [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if we could not make an arrangement by which we could bring the discussion of this subject to a close? I wonder how the time runs in the matter of debate to-day, for and against the general proposition, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Of the time so far consumed, 1 hour and 30 minutes has been used in favor of the two amendments and one hour against them.

Mr. FRENCH. I wonder if we could arrive at any understanding now as to the probable amount of time required by these several gentlemen?

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. LOWREY. I want two minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want five minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And I want five minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to have 10 minutes. I ask for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRENCH. I do not want to limit the time, but the time asked, including that asked for on this side, in all amounts to nearly an hour and a half.

Mr. BLANTON. We are about three weeks ahead on our supply bills anyway. We have plenty of time. This is an important matter. Let us go on as we are going. There is no hurry.

Mr. SABATH. Let us proceed.

Mr. FRENCH. I think probably so many Members are wanting time that we can not arrive at a definite agreement at this

moment. But I hope Members will be as moderate as they can on the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]. The Chair is alternating.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the President in this matter, partly for the reasons advanced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], which I thought were very cogent and compelling, and partly for other reasons.

Mr. Chairman, this is an age of propaganda, and upon no other subject has it been so freely used as upon that of national armament, with a view to frightening the American people and causing them to believe that they have an insufficient Navy and that advantage was taken of this Nation in the disarmament treaty. I shall not go into the motives which are behind this procedure, although in some instances I think they are bad; but those who are carrying on this propaganda have been greatly aided by the sensational newspapers which are eager for any statement that startles or frightens the public and such a statement is more likely to obtain publicity even in the most reputable and conservative journals than are prosaic facts or calm discussion and argument. Indeed, it has already become apparent in the course of this debate that many Members of the House—perhaps a majority—have been so influenced by this propaganda, which regards neither facts nor reason, that they have been entirely swept off from their feet and are not willing to give the other side a reasonable opportunity to be heard. Among those who have been so influenced there is apparently my dear friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who addressed you a few moments ago, and who has made a most remarkable change in his sentiments from those which he expressed to this House at former sessions.

Mr. BUTLER. My friend has never agreed with me on this subject; he has opposed every measure that I have had in here.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is in error. Before the war, at a time when Germany was threatening this country, no man was more in favor of a large Navy than I.

Mr. BUTLER. That is true.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is fair to acknowledge that. But I do not want to go into these matters at this time.

My friend from Pennsylvania said he regretted that he had ever supported the Washington conference and the Washington treaty.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. What I said and what I say again and what I shall continue to say when I can say anything is that I regret we destroyed our ships of war. What has been done in the last two years?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Members of the House had no direct part in the ratification of the proceedings of that conference. I supported it then, as did the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am proud of the work of the conference, and I support it now. [Applause.] I say it has been of inestimable benefit to this country and to the world as a whole. At that time, as was well said by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], we were preparing to build six mammoth warships. The cost of building them would have been at least \$300,000,000, and such gigantic vessels as those would require support from additional cruisers, destroyers, torpedo boats, and submarines. If we had carried on that program our Navy expenditures, at a moderate calculation, would have been doubled annually. We will have saved \$3,000,000,000 at least when the 10-year period is up.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I hope my friend will excuse me. He can speak later on. The other nations of the world have saved altogether more than a corresponding amount. But that is not all. It was the first occasion when the nations of the world voluntarily agreed to limit their armaments. In this respect it marked a place in history. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania says he was deceived somewhat by the preamble adopted by the conference. I do not know how the treaty could be misread. It limited only the construction of battleships, the tonnage, and armament of cruisers. These provisions have been faithfully carried out. I shall not at this point in my remarks undertake to go into details. I shall only say that after the agreements of that conference had been put into effect we possessed a Navy equal in all respects and in many respects superior to that of Great Britain; that, ship for ship, and gun for gun, and armament for armament, our Navy was more powerful than that of England.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Does the gentleman say at the present time it is?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I say it is now, and I will support that statement by the facts and figures which I shall later on give to the House.

But first let me proceed with some remarks with reference to my position with reference to the disarmament conference.

After the Civil War, our Navy was maintained for only a short time, and then neglected. For a number of years we spent only about from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 annually on the Navy, and this included everything for both ships and personnel. The result was that all of our ships became obsolete. Then, along in President Cleveland's first administration, we built a few small cruisers, but for some time we had practically no Navy. During all this period England's policy was to have a navy which was superior to any other two navies in the world.

In this respect it did not need to count ours, as our force was negligible. But gradually the Navy was increased until, in President Roosevelt's time, it came to be ranked as one of the great navies of the world. Later on, Germany commenced increasing its navy, until it was questionable whether it was not superior to ours. I could see no purpose on Germany's part except that of aggression, and from my entrance in Congress up until the time after the Great War had concluded, I supported the largest appropriations that were offered for the increase of our Navy. During the war we spent enormous sums on our Navy, and at its end it was greater than ever before. No sooner had the war ended, than the great naval powers, including the United States, began plans for the increase of their navies; and we undertook to surpass them all by planning and beginning the construction of eight monster vessels, carrying far heavier armor and armament than was then afloat, each having engines with more horse-power than the great Keokuk Dam, which uses all the water of the Mississippi and furnishes power and light for the city of St. Louis and other towns of smaller population in that vicinity. At that time England had constructed no capital ships since the war, except the *Hood*, a battle cruiser of 41,200 tons, which was not completed until after the war. These preparations were not unnoticed by Japan, and that country became actively engaged in the construction of large battleships, to match the American and English program.

Every member of the Naval Affairs Committee will agree, whatever their position may be on the matter which is the subject of the debate to-day, that if these great vessels which had been planned for the American Navy had been built, they could not have operated in time of war without a corresponding number of auxiliary vessels of all sorts. That would have required additional cruisers, additional destroyers, more submarines; and for all of this additional construction, as well as of the great ships themselves, an immense addition to the personnel of the Navy, and an immense increase in the cost of operation. The total cost of the construction and operation would have been staggering, even in so wealthy a nation as our own. These great vessels would have cost \$50,000,000 each, merely for construction.

It has sometimes been estimated that the total cost of carrying on our Navy, if these plans had been fully and completely carried out, would have been a billion dollars per annum. I repeat that at a perfectly safe and conservative estimate the cost of our Navy would have been annually at least twice what it is now; and for the 10 years which the disarmament treaty covers, we shall save not less than \$3,000,000,000. Other nations that could less afford to spend the money will have saved equal sums, if, indeed, they could have managed in any possible way to carry out such a program. It is not at all improbable that, seeing bankruptcy approaching, and considering that such a great navy was for purposes of aggression, some of the other nations would have thought that they had better fight at once than wait until they were helpless. It is just this sort of a thing that the President now seeks to prevent. An overwhelming, or at least an unreasonable, superiority in force tends to provoke war and unite other nations against the particular country which seeks it. It was this that caused Germany to go to war and the other nations to unite against her. I insist that the disarmament conference was one of the greatest achievements of American statesmanship, and that President Harding and the statesmen, both Democrats and Republicans, who cooperated with him in bringing about the disarmament treaty are entitled to the greatest of credit.

It is often said that advantage was taken of this Nation in the treaty which was finally completed and that our negotiators were in some way misled or deceived. How can this be possible, when they had by their sides the best experts of our Navy,

unless those experts were not merely asleep but chloroformed? They tell you that England and Japan got everything they wanted. But the real fact is that the jingoes of those countries were then and are now protesting that the United States got the advantage in the provisions of the treaty, and every year are clamoring for an increase in their respective navies on account of the strength of ours.

Let us see what the real facts are, the unquestioned and undisputed facts, taken from works of the highest authority, like Jane's Fighting Ships, which I have before me, the accuracy of which no gentleman, no matter what position he takes on the question under discussion, will dispute. In this work we find a full description of every ship in the English and American Navies. The number, size, caliber, and range of the guns of each are given, the thickness and location of the armor, the horse-power of the engines, and the designed speed of each vessel, the date of the completion of each, the number of the torpedo tubes that each carries, the special features of each ship, all in great detail, including any peculiarity or advantage for its style of construction, its protection against torpedoes by bulges or double or triple hulls, and so forth, to an extent that requires a large volume to specify.

The special matter under discussion is the construction of new cruisers, and I shall admit right here that in total cruiser strength the United States is inferior to Great Britain, but I deny that our fleet, as a whole, is inferior, and I shall undertake to show from the authority I have mentioned that the American fleet is, as a whole, equal to that of England as a fighting force and is superior to that of Japan in the ratio provided by the treaty. Assertions as are sometimes made in newspapers and periodicals to the effect that instead of America having kept to the 5-5-3 ratio provided for by the treaty, Japan's ratio being that of 3, that our fleet now occupies the position that Japan should occupy, are too ridiculous to merit consideration.

The organization of a battle fleet is built around the battleships and battle cruisers, or, as they are often called, capital ships, and the alleged inferiority of our Navy is largely based on the comparison of the ships which the three great naval powers were permitted to retain. The proposal made by our country at the disarmament conference was that the United States and Great Britain should each have in capital ships 500,000 tons and Japan 300,000 tons. As finally adopted, the plan became 525,000 tons each for the United States and the British Empire and 315,000 tons for Japan.

The original proposition as to tonnage would have involved, on the part of Japan, the scrapping of the *Mutsu*, a new battleship practically completed, built to a large extent through private offerings of the Japanese people, which surrounded it with a sentimental attachment. Beside this, the other nations were not asked to scrap any new and practically completed vessels as finally adopted. We were permitted to complete the construction of two ships of the *West Virginia* class, a little smaller than the *Mutsu* but carrying the same armament in heavy guns and with a heavier armor. The *Mutsu* is, however, somewhat faster. Each of the two ships we were permitted to finish were practically the equal of the *Mutsu*, yet it is claimed we made a great sacrifice in permitting its construction. Great Britain was to be permitted to build two new ships not exceeding 35,000 tons each, which was the limit in size permitted by the treaty, and when they were constructed, four battleships at the foot of its line were to be scrapped. It is true that we agreed to scrap 28 ships under the treaty, but a number of these ought to have been scrapped long before. England had already scrapped better ships. In fact, after the war, before the disarmament conference took place, she scrapped 619 vessels, among which were 28 battleships, 4 battle cruisers, 275 destroyers, 54 light cruisers, and 5 battleships were put on sale. Consequently, at the time of the conference England did not have as many ships to be scrapped as the United States had, for we had held on to many old useless and auxiliary vessels; but England agreed to scrap 20 and Japan 10, among which were 4 in the course of construction. It is, however, only fair to say that of partially constructed vessels the United States scrapped the most and England the least. But it was not possible to reach a perfect equality in this matter, and I have already shown what would have been required if we had gone ahead and completed the gigantic battle cruisers as had been proposed. The loss incurred in scrapping our partly completed construction on these vessels was small compared to what we have gained otherwise in the matter of consequent expense.

Now, let us consider a little more particularly our battleships in comparison with those of England, taking the specifications in Jane's Fighting Ships, 1926. It is impossible for me here to go into all of the technical details, but if any of you would take

this book and make a comparison for yourselves, you will discover that, ship for ship, both in armor and armament, ours are much superior to the English ships. Some of the English ships exceed ours in speed, some do not. With the exception of the *Hood* and the other battle cruisers any superiority in speed is slight, but the superiority of our ships in armor and in size of guns is very considerable. All Members may not understand the distinction between a battleship, a battle cruiser, and a cruiser. The modern cruiser is an exceedingly fast vessel, but so lightly armored that it is practically defenseless against a battle cruiser or battleship. The battle cruiser and the battleship are both large vessels, carrying much heavier guns than the cruiser carries. The battle cruiser carries much heavier armor than the cruiser, but in comparison with the battleship its armor is much lighter, and experience has shown that it can not successfully stand the pounding of heavy guns in actual battle. It has its advantages for certain purposes, but experts have doubted whether any more will be built. England has four, including the powerful *Hood*, but the three others are much smaller ships. England had an unfortunate experience with her battle cruisers in the battle of Jutland, where three of them were blown up and sunk by reason of the German shells piercing their armor in vital spots. The 12-inch gun was the largest that the Germans had in that battle, and there are only a few of our capital ships that do not carry larger guns. One of the battle cruisers thus destroyed was of substantially the same size and fighting capacity as those now retained in the English and Japanese Navies. When they talk to you about the inferiority of our battle fleet they never mention the battle cruisers which are included in the British and Japanese lines.

As I want to be fair, I will concede that the speed of the English ships may enable them to arrive quicker at a given point than ours, and that may be an advantage in maneuvering, but they have acquired this in great loss in the power of attack and power of defense. The German admiral, Scheer, who commanded at the Battle of Jutland a fleet much inferior to the British fleet which opposed him, said afterwards that the first requisite of the battleship was that it should keep afloat. Our ships being superior in armor and armament will keep afloat if any of them do.

The Battle of Jutland taught many lessons with reference to the construction of a battle fleet, and in this we have a great advantage. We have seven battleships of what is known as the post-Jutland class—that is, in their construction the lessons of that great naval battle were embodied. England has only one post-Jutland ship, the *Hood*, which was begun before that battle. The four ships of English line of battle which come next in point of age were laid down before the World War and completed in the early part of it.

We have the same advantage over the Japanese, for that country has constructed only two battleships since the war, while we have completed six. Our battle fleet carries more than twice as many big guns as that of Japan, having 192 to 96 for that country. It is true that 44 of the guns on our ships are 12 inch, while the Japanese are 14 and 16 inches, but of 16-inch guns we have 24 in number as against only 16 for Japan; and of 14-inch guns we have 124 to 80, and, so far as the 12-inch guns are concerned, the Battle of Jutland showed that they were not yet out of date.

We have often been told that the guns of the British battle fleet far outrange those of ours. I have myself been unable to get complete data on this subject, but the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] some time ago inserted in the RECORD (68th Cong., 1st sess., p. 9267) a statement on this matter which, I understand, he obtained from the Navy Department itself, giving the range of the guns on each of the British and American ships of the battle line, and there has been no change since he made it. From this statement it appears that, beginning at the bottom of the list, eight battleships of ours have a range of from 500 to 800 yards less than that of comparable British ships; we have five of about the same range as the British ships; but we also have five that far outrange anything the British have on battleships or battle cruisers. If there is anything in this question of ranges, the British fleet, in conflict with ours, ought to be defeated before it could get our fleet within range of its guns. But I doubt whether there is anything of importance in this matter of ranges. I am well aware that many of our naval officers take the contrary view, and even talk about hits being made beyond the range of vision of the firing ship with the aid of spotting airplanes far ahead and higher in the air. But shooting at a target on clear days with a comparatively smooth sea and especially with no enemy to make it interesting is a very different thing from battle conditions, for the enemy's airplanes would certainly occupy the attention of our own. But this is not all; the shortest range of the big guns of any American battleship is nearly 12 miles.

In actual battle, nothing has ever been lit above the range of 15,000 yards, which is 6,000 below the shortest range of any of our battleships, which extends as far as anything can be seen from the ships themselves.

This makes me think of the matter of torpedo tubes, with which, the gentleman from Pennsylvania truly says, the English fleet is equipped in much greater numbers than our own. The question of how many torpedo tubes a vessel should have is a matter of design, as to which naval constructors differ. Our new cruisers do not have as many as those of the new British cruisers, but a large number of torpedoes on board a ship whose armor would have about as much effect in stopping a shot from an 8-inch gun as a card house has against an automatic rifle, may be of more danger to the ship that carries them than to those of the enemy. Moreover, torpedo tubes can not be handled like a gun on a turret, and the use of the torpedo depends largely on the mobility and quick turning of the ship, unless it is carried by a submarine. For this reason, and also by reason of the distance at which naval battles are usually fought, in the late war only three hits by torpedoes were registered, except by those fired from submarines; and of these three hits only one was made by a torpedo fired from a cruiser. The more nimble and quicker-turning destroyers fired the torpedoes in the other cases.

The disarmament conference did not limit the number of cruisers or of submarines. It did, however, provide that no cruiser should be built that was larger than 10,000 tons and carried heavier guns than 8 inch. We have some much larger cruisers than this, built before the conference, which carry 10-inch guns and armor comparatively heavy for a cruiser. The value of these ships, however, is problematical for modern warfare, but they are more powerful than English and Japanese armored cruisers. We have some old cruisers that are practically obsolete and some that are only useful for special purposes. On the other hand, England has a very large number of smaller cruisers, which can only be used for special purposes. In light cruisers we have 10 very fine and fast vessels of 7,500 tons recently constructed. We also have two 10,000-ton cruisers under construction and three more of the same size, for which the contracts are being let, and three others of the same class authorized but not yet appropriated for.

These cruisers are to be heavily armored, with 8-inch guns, which, as I have heretofore noted, are the largest permitted. It is these last three that are involved in this amendment under discussion, and if it were not for the negotiations which the President is now conducting, and which might be hampered thereby, I would be willing to vote for an appropriation to build these cruisers. We have more of the modern cruisers than England; but, on the whole, it must be said in fairness that England is superior in the matter of cruisers and Japan probably not inferior, although many of its cruisers are small and some of its larger ones of an obsolete type. On the other hand, we are much superior to England and overwhelmingly superior to Japan in the matter of destroyers; in fact, we have as many as both of them put together. The fast cruiser has been said to be the eyes of the fleet, but of late years some naval experts think one airplane is worth five cruisers for scouting purposes. That the destroyer is the most effective opponent of the submarine there is no question. We have not yet completed any fleet submarines; that is, submarines capable of accompanying the battle fleet on long voyages, and it is doubtful whether we need any, for reasons which I will further state; but, on the whole, I think our deficiency in cruisers is more than offset by our superiority in destroyers and submarines.

But what about the two new English battleships which it is claimed will be completed this year? One of them will, in all probability, not be completed before 1929, or, at least, not be commissioned until that time. One thing is certain, and that is that England has been in no hurry about completing them. As before stated, when they are completed England is to scrap four of its weakest battleships. It will still have three battle cruisers in its battle line, and the weakness of this type of vessel has already been pointed out. The two new battleships when completed, being slightly larger and more recently built, will probably be somewhat superior to any two of our leading ships, although they will carry no heavier guns and probably no heavier armor. But from there on down the line our battleships will be superior.

In comparing any two navies, there will always be some point in which one may be superior to the other in some respects. There are some things in which our Navy is lacking, and always will be, no matter how much is spent upon it. There never will be a time when, as a fighting unit, it can not be improved. In fact, nothing seems to change more rapidly than the science of naval architecture and, even in peace, we find an enormous wastage on account of fighting ships becom-

ing obsolete in from 15 to 20 years. While England and Japan are superior in the number of cruisers, in actual use with the battle fleet, England would find it difficult to employ as many as we could. In making proposals for disarmament, in fairness we ought to take into consideration the situation of the other nations, as well as that of our own. England has more cruisers, but it needs three times as many. It has possessions in every part of the globe, and must maintain a fleet on every ocean. A blockade of seven weeks would result in practical exhaustion of its food supplies, and in a short time thereafter would compel its complete submission. A broad ocean separates us from any enemy having a navy worth mentioning, and naval experts are agreed that no battle fleet can operate in times of war more than 2,000 miles from its base. Alone among the great naval powers we are self-sustaining. We have an abundant supply of iron, coal, copper, oil; in fact, of all kinds of war material except nitrates—which we can now manufacture—and we have a surplus of foodstuffs. We hold more than one-half of the gold of the world. Our national resources are incomparably superior to those of any possible enemy. Yet, like every other power, we insist that our fleet is built only for defense; and while so insisting, we ought to be reasonable enough to take into consideration the situation of other powers not so advantageously located. If we do this, we must admit that no other nation has so much need of a navy as Great Britain and that Japan can not rightfully be criticized for wanting a number of cruisers.

Peace can not be preserved without effort any more than war can be carried on without preparation. I believe firmly in reasonable preparation, but we ought not to make such preparations as will engender suspicions on the part of other nations that our Navy is being built for aggression. Already it is asked by other nations why we need such a great fleet as we have now, considering our extremely advantageous situation. Modern warfare requires not only fleets and armies, but when they reach any size they are prodigiously expensive in peace and practically beyond calculation in war. Our wealth is far greater and our financial position far stronger than that of any other nation. England, it is true, comes next to us, but it staggers under a load of debt and taxation. While Japan did not enter into the last war except with her navy, it too is burdened with a great debt and its natural resources are extremely small. It could hardly carry on a war or supply its people with food if its coast was blockaded or even the free passage of its ships interrupted.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in his very able speech has shown that the atmosphere of distrust that seems to everywhere pervade international relations immediately after the war has, to a large extent, been dissipated. The Locarno conference marked in that respect almost as great an advance as did the disarmament conference. It is of the utmost importance at this time that we should not do anything that will embarrass the President in his negotiations for an extension of the disarmament agreement. On the contrary, we ought to do all that we reasonably can to dispel distrust and suspicion of our motives. Europe is sick of war—sick nearly unto death. Its fairest fields and some of its most populous cities were ruined by the war's devastation. Poverty and unemployment are found on nearly every hand, and the ever-present question is how its debts can be met without its business being crushed by taxation. I can not believe that its statesmen have learned nothing from the frightful lessons of the war; and it is quite certain that none of its nations were ever in such an unfavorable condition to undertake a war with the United States. Germany is completely disarmed; and after more than a century of peace with England and Japan let us not be stampeded by the alarmists when there is nothing to be alarmed about, but, rather, follow and adopt the wise policy favored by the President.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the Members on both sides of the aisle, and upon all sides of the question, have been so generous to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations that I hesitate to ask any favor, and yet in view of the very limited time, and in view of the grilling the chairman of the subcommittee has had for some three days past in questions asked, I am going to request to be permitted to proceed for a little while uninterrupted.

The debate on whether this Congress shall make appropriation for the beginning of construction of three light cruisers is drawing to a close. What is the issue?

In December, 1924, the Congress passed an act authorizing the construction of eight cruisers of 10,000 tons each, construction to be begun before July 1, 1927. Of these eight, five have either been commenced or appropriated for and three await appropriation for their commencement.

The act provides that in event of an international conference for the limitation of naval armaments the President is empowered, in his discretion, to suspend in whole or in part any or all alterations or construction authorized under the act.

The President has recommended to the present Congress that in view of preliminary conferences now in progress looking to the working out of an agenda for a plenary conference on limitation of armaments no appropriation be made for the commencement of construction of the three cruisers. The President has further recommended that the time within which construction may be begun upon the cruisers be extended from July 1, 1927.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] has offered an amendment appropriating \$1,200,000 to commence construction, notwithstanding the attitude of the President, and the gentleman from Connecticut has offered a substitute amendment fixing the amount at \$450,000 for the same purpose.

I mention the foregoing thus distinctly because the press has carried the announcement that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has stated that there was no conflict between the House and the President, merely a difference of opinion.

If the problem involved alone the size of money appropriations, the proponent of the amendment would be correct. But it is more than that. The problem involves the attitude of the United States in view of negotiations looking to further limitation of armaments and whether we are going to encourage a race in the building of naval craft. The positions are as far apart as the east is from the west. It is not a question of dollars; it is a question of principle that goes to the very foundation of the whole program of limitation of armaments. [Applause.]

Members should bear in mind that the amount carried in the amendment is the beginning of a program of expenditure for construction of \$50,250,000. But since each ship will cost \$16,750,000, the amount allocated to each will not be enough to rest calling for bids and contracts upon, and hence, in a practical sense there is nothing to be gained by the appropriation. If gentlemen want to make an appropriation that will be effective, let them write it in terms of some \$10,000,000.

But aside from the inadequate amount of money included in the amendment, if it is calculated to be effective, may I sum up the reasons that control me in opposing any appropriation whatever for new cruiser building.

The first controlling element is that the President asks for delay because of a prospective armaments conference. The second is that the administration recognizes that the cruiser strength of the United States must be augmented, or the ratio adjusted so that ultimately the United States and the other great powers will be upon a parity.

The third is that the Government of the United States through its Congress and through the frank declaration of policy of its Chief Executive is committed to a program of further limitation of armaments if it can be brought about.

So far as the Congress is concerned such a program found expression in 1916, when the great President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, was requested to consider calling together an international conference for the adjudication of disputes.

This policy was expressed in the act of Congress of 1923, when the President was called upon to exercise his good offices looking to the calling of another limitation-of-armaments conference. It was recognized by the Congress when this same declaration was expressed in the act of 1924, and again in 1925, when the Congress reaffirmed its adherence to such a policy. More than that, the Congress gave expression to its adherence to this principle when it passed the special act under which the cruiser-construction program was authorized in December, 1924, and when in that act the Congress specifically wrote the words conferring upon the President complete authority to stop the program of construction at any time when it might seem advisable in connection with conferences looking to the limitation of armaments.

Turning to the executive branch of the Government, time prevents me from more than reminding you that the late Presidents Wilson and Harding counted it as part of their life work to aid in leading our country and the world in ways of peace and for the reduction of the burdens of armaments.

Now what has been the attitude of President Coolidge upon the subject? He has been in the most complete accord. In the

message of the President to the Congress in December, 1924, President Coolidge said:

Many times I have expressed my desire to see the work of the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armaments appropriately supplemented by further agreements for a further reduction and for the purpose of diminishing the menace and waste of competition in preparing instruments of international war.

Again on December 8, 1925, President Coolidge in his message to the Congress said:

Under congressional sanction it would seem to be wise to participate in any conference of the great powers for naval limitations of armaments proposed upon such conditions that it would hold a fair promise of being effective. The general policy of our country is for disarmament and it ought not to hesitate to adopt any practical plan that might reasonably be expected to succeed.

On January 4, 1926, the President sent another message to Congress with regard to participation in the work of the preparatory commission set up by the Council of the League of Nations for preparing for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments. Following this the President delegated representatives to attend what might be called the preliminary conference that convened last year in Geneva. Constantly the President has taken an interest in the activities of that conference.

The President in his message to this Congress in December, 1926, used these words:

No threatening cloud at the present time darkens the sky. Our intent and attitude is one of peace and friendly regard toward all nations and peoples.

Again, in referring specifically to the question of more cruisers at this time, the President said:

While on the subject of our national defenses, it is proper to state that no provision is made in the estimates for the Navy Department for commencing the construction of the remaining three of six light cruisers which the act of December 18, 1924, authorized to be undertaken prior to July, 1927. This country is now engaged in negotiations to broaden our existing treaties with the great powers which deal with the elimination of competition in naval armaments. I feel that it would be unfortunate at this time and not in keeping with our attitude toward these negotiations to commence the construction of these three cruisers; rather do I recommend to the Congress the enactment of legislation which will extend the time for beginning their construction.

The President at Trenton, N. J., on December 29, 1926, in a most notable address, declared:

I do not believe we can advance the policy of peace by a return to the policy of competitive armaments. While I favor an adequate Army and Navy, I am opposed to any effort to militarize this Nation.

Finally, to meet the apprehension that the President had modified his position, you will recall the letter that the President wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Appropriations, which was read to the House two days ago, in which he indicated his position squarely and frankly, and reiterated that he stood by the message to this Congress of one month ago.

What does the gentleman from Connecticut, who offers the amendment for appropriation of money for three new cruisers, hope to gain? He bases his amendment upon the authority of the act of Congress of December 18, 1924. That very act declares that the President has the power to withhold any moneys appropriated for construction purposes, when, in his judgment, it is desirable to do so in connection with further limitation of armaments programs. Then, if the gentleman recognizes—as he apparently does in his speech in support of his amendment—that this ample power is conferred upon the President, again I ask what does he hope to gain?

The preliminary conference for the purpose of working out an agenda, if possible, for a plenary limitation of armaments conference is now in recess. It will not convene again until next March or April. It will doubtless be in session for many months. Surely the President would not feel justified in acting upon the availability of an appropriation for construction work for the commencement of new cruisers. Indeed, the amount of money that it is proposed in the appropriation is so small that it can do little, if anything, more than suffice for the working out of plans and designs for new cruisers, if that were possible. Then, I say, what does the gentleman hope to gain? His action amounts to a gesture.

WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT OF HIS GESTURE?

Gentlemen, the people of the United States will recognize almost at once the futility of the gesture in view of the inade-

quate appropriation and the utter unlikelihood of the President feeling that it is desirable to commence construction work. On the other hand, the other nations of the world will not take this view of the situation.

The other nations of the world will be filled with apprehension. The story of this amendment will be carried in the press of Great Britain and Japan and France and Italy and the other great powers as a declaration of the policy of Congress to continue to build new battle craft notwithstanding the fact that we are in the midst of preliminary negotiations looking to a further conference on limitation of armaments.

Gentlemen, this is the momentous aspect of the whole question. This, I have no doubt, is the point of view that controls the President when he appeals to you in his message to this Congress in the interest of furtherance of limitation of armaments not to appropriate money for the commencement of new cruisers because it would be misunderstood.

Do gentlemen realize what the effect of activities upon the part of one nation in what are called defense military programs have upon other nations? Let me recall a few illustrations.

In 1925, when the British construction program was before the British Parliament, the leaders there declared that if it should pass it would be used as the very reason for an eight-cruiser program on the part of the United States; and then when that was passed this action in our Congress would be used by the British Parliament as the reason for another step for armament. [Applause.]

To-day there is a living demonstration of the truth of the prophecy that was uttered in the British Parliament one and one-half years ago.

On December 15 last Mr. Hector Bywater, the distinguished British naval critic, in a paper that appeared in the Baltimore Sun, declared:

The consensus of opinion in the navy (British officers) is that the battle fleet [British] is too small for imperial requirements—

And again:

Taking all factors into consideration, the American Fleet is judged to be superior—

And again:

Even in gun power the advantage is held to lie with the American Fleet.

Turning to Japan, Mr. Kawakami, the brilliant Japanese correspondent on naval matters, declared in the Baltimore Sun on December 7 last, in connection with the proposed Japanese ship-building program of \$130,600,000 over a period of five years:

The virtual adoption of Japan of a new naval program is perhaps another argument for the necessity of a new naval treaty to check naval competition among the leading powers more effectively than was accomplished by the Washington treaty. * * * In a sense, it is a repercussion of the British project to establish a gigantic naval base at Singapore. * * *

Building programs and agitation for building programs in other nations disturb America in just the same way.

Our colleague, Representative BUTLER, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, is quoted in the Washington Post of December 27 last as saying:

There is a new high-speed race of naval supremacy on between the nations and we are not in the race. * * *

It will require 50 ships of war to bring us up to our place; it will take \$400,000,000 or maybe more.

* * * So we have got to build up. We have got to build up fast.

Let me cite but one other illustration:

Sir Edward Grey, Great Britain's brilliant statesman and Foreign Secretary during the early part of the World War, says in his *Twenty-five Years*, volume 1, pages 88, 89, and 90:

The distinction between preparations made with the intention of going to war and precautions against attack is a true distinction, clear and definite in the mind of those who build up armaments. But it is a distinction that is not obvious or certain to others. * * * Each government, therefore, while resenting any suggestion that its own measures are anything more than precaution for defense, regards similar measures of another government as preparation to attack.

The moral is obvious; it is that great armaments lead inevitably to war. If there are armaments on one side there must be armaments on other sides.

* * * Each measure taken by one nation is noted and leads to countermeasures by others.

Then, turning to the causes of the World War, Lord Grey continues:

The enormous growth of armaments in Europe, the sense of insecurity and fear caused by them—it was these that made war inevitable. This, it seems to me, is the truest reading of history, and the lesson that the present should be learning from the past in the interest of future peace, the warning to be handed on to those who come after us.

But, gentlemen, if ambitious programs of rival nations inspire ambitious programs in other nations, the converse is also true. Moderate programs for the United States will be answered by conservative programs by Japan, and conservative programs by Japan will be matched by moderate programs in Great Britain.

I tell you that the action that is proposed in the amendment that you will be called upon to vote for or against within a few minutes will be calculated to disturb the Parliament of Great Britain, the legislative body of Japan, the parliaments and chancelleries of all the great powers of the world. [Applause.]

I have already in my general statement indicated facts that established beyond the question of a doubt that if the United States was upon an approximate 5-5-3 ratio at the time the limitation of armaments conference was agreed to nearly five years ago, its position to-day is actually and relatively no less strong than it was then. I have demonstrated to you that in cruiser strength, the position of the United States to-day relatively and actually is better than it was then. I have brought to you the solemn assurance that naval officers gave to our committee that in their judgment the other nations that are parties signatory to the limitation of armaments conference are keeping the letter and the spirit of their obligations under that treaty. I have indicated to you in terms and figures that are indisputable that the programs you have been told of in connection with building programs of foreign countries are wildly exaggerated by the propagandists who are crowding upon you and upon parliaments of all the other great nations programs for ship construction.

Now, let us turn for a moment to the provision of the act of December, 1924, under which the President may withhold expenditures of any appropriation for the building program authorized in event it would be desirable in view of further limitation of armaments conferences.

It was not in the bill that was reported to the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. The amendment itself, that section, was proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE], and was accepted by the Congress by a unanimous vote. Most of you were here. There is a record vote upon the passage of the bill containing the provision. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] did not object to the provision of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] did not object to it. The Speaker of the House did not object to it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK], who has offered the original amendment, did not object to it. More than that, as I run down the list of names I find that all of those gentlemen on the roll call voted for the passage of the act. After having conferred that power upon the President, are you now willing to turn around and say that you are going to repeal it at the same time you appropriate money for the commencement of these three cruisers?

You conferred that discretionary power upon him, and you put it into the law. Are you going to repeal that? That is not in the provision of the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON]. It is not in the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK]. They do not propose to repeal that discretionary power on the part of the President of the United States. Then, if that is so, it must remain true that the President, if you pass this appropriation, will still have discretionary authority, and what will be the effect? I think the President will desire to exercise discretionary authority, and if he does, it will mean in my opinion that we will not begin the cruisers; it will mean that the United States will understand it, but it will also mean that we will have appropriated \$450,000 which the world will understand is for the beginning of the program. [Applause.] That is the vice of the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask the gentleman what did I do that was wrong?

Mr. FRENCH. Why, bless your heart, you did not do a thing that was wrong.

Mr. BUTLER. But what did I do?

Mr. FRENCH. You did not get the import of my remarks. I just stated that you were agreeable to the Montague amendment conferring authority upon the President to refuse to expend money appropriated for ship building if it should seem unnecessary through further limitation agreements. I further

said that you would not vote to undo the authority, and that, therefore, the pending amendment is an idle gesture.

The President has been charged by this Congress over and over again with the responsibility of leadership in bringing about still further limitation of armaments. You now propose to embarrass him. The President has specifically asked you not to make appropriations for the commencement of three new cruisers. You by your act propose to make such appropriations and thereby make more difficult the work which you have trusted to his discretion.

TREMENDOUS PROPAGANDA

Gentlemen, I know the terrific propaganda that is being directed against you. I recognize that from every navy-yard city in the United States, from every center where there are private industrial concerns that would be benefited by larger shipbuilding programs, the propaganda seems terrific, and the sentiment is made to appear nation-wide for the immediate construction of additional cruisers for the United States Navy.

Let me cite an illustration: Five years ago, following the Limitation of Armaments Conference, when we were then about to discontinue work on ships in some of the navy yards, we were petitioned not to do anything that would disturb construction. In one instance 40 of the outstanding business men of a city where there is a navy yard came before our committee and begged us not to do a thing that would disturb the situation there; and when we were considering it and asking them questions this was the substance of the conversation that ensued: "Do you believe in the treaty for the limitation of armaments?" The answer was: "Yes." "Do you believe we ought to build ships to sink them?" They said, "No." "Do you believe we ought to build ships in violation of the treaty?" They said, "No." We did not ask them "Do you want us to close every navy yard except yours?" But if they had answered honestly such a question, they would have said, "Yes; if necessary to keep ours open."

Another navy yard took up the matter with us, and finally in their despair they brought their women and children into the appeal. They petitioned us through the wives, who asked: "Do you mean to take the bread and the butter out of the mouths of our babies?" I appeal to you not to let the interests of local communities and groups transcend the interests of our country. I appeal to you not to let the selfish desires of some pent-up Utica take precedence over the welfare of our Republic.

I appeal to you not to be swept from your feet by the exaggerated and false premises that are being used as the basis for immediate increase of naval armaments.

I appeal to you to vote down this proposed appropriation for money for new construction work that can have but one effect, and that is of making other nations of the world suspicious of the policy of the United States and thereby increasing the burden of the President in his negotiations.

I appeal to you, then, to support the program recommended by the President, a program based upon his knowledge of international ambitions, fears, and hopes, looking to another conference for the limitation of armament. Do this and you will contribute a service that may be of epochal benefit to your country, to the nations great and small, and in the interest of civilization and humanity for all time. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, watching the proceedings of yesterday and to-day has forced us rather to suspect that there was present here an antiadministration political round robin; but until our beloved colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], in his speech, admitted it a few moments ago, we did not know it actually to exist.

Administration policies and congressional policies, if you please, are influenced after all by the will of the people. We are fixing now, in the adoption of this proposition to retrograde and to destroy the peace progress of 200 years in our Nation. If we are strong enough to carry out our disarmament program and let the nations and the people of foreign countries understand that we are going to disarm, that we are going to keep our 5-5-3 pact treaty, you will find the very countries now that are seeking to evade it will jump into line in consequence of the public sentiment of their people, who will force them to do it. They are permitting their nations to-day to evade the principles of that treaty simply because they are made to fear, through insidious representations of their naval experts, that the United States is evading its part of the contract and is outrivaling them in naval armaments.

I can not forget that our naval experts—these self-same naval experts, if you please—went before our beloved colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and his committee with false propaganda and had him bring in a bill here to appropriate \$6,500,000 to raise the range of our guns on certain battleships.

They represented to our colleague that England had done that very thing, and had done it in violation of the treaty, and had outstripped us, and that Japan would do likewise; and he, aided and abetted by our friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] and our genial colleague from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], brought that bill here on the floor of the House for urgent passage.

On that occasion I read to you the part of the treaty which prohibited us from raising the range of our guns. I made a point of order against it. I was overruled; and after a few of us here had blocked the passage of that bill for months, it was finally passed. After months it was finally passed, simply because war-scare speeches were made, and the money was appropriated and turned over to the Navy Department for expenditure. But the State Department, in the exercise of its good judgment, held that such proposal did violate the 5-5-3 treaty, and the President of the United States ordered the Navy Department not to expend a dollar of that \$6,500,000, and it was not spent.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment, when I conclude this statement. Our distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the great chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, then came on the floor of this House with the proposal to turn back into the Treasury that \$6,500,000. And what did he say? He said that our Government had investigated the matter and had found out that these naval officers, our naval experts, if you please, had lied to us. That is what he said—that they had lied to us; that Great Britain was not violating the treaty, and had not violated it, and that Japan had not violated it, and this House sustained him and passed the legislation and turned back into the people's Treasury that \$6,500,000, and saved it. And we saved our honor, because we kept our treaty and did not violate it. And those selfsame naval experts now are before the committee of my distinguished and beloved colleague from Pennsylvania again and have persuaded him to bring in another measure, so the press reports, to raise the range of our guns in spite of treaties, in spite of our State Department, in spite of the President, and in spite of MARTIN B. MADDEN and this Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. I beg the gentleman from Texas not to let me suffer longer here. I opposed that here and was beaten by 40 majority in the House, and my friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] and I almost got into a personal quarrel about it.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman's committee reported it favorably and finally passed it in spite of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendments, on the paragraph and all amendments thereto, close in five minutes. The reason I do that is because I understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has an amendment to offer which I feel he should have the privilege of offering.

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman ought to be fair. He was not objected to and I want two minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the motion of the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, by unanimous consent may I make a statement covering about a half minute?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. TILSON. I yield if the gentleman objects.

Mr. BLANTON. I simply want to finish my speech and do not want it interspersed with other remarks.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, let me make one statement which I think will bring this thing to an end. The gentleman from Texas is entitled, I think, to finish a sentence or two.

Mr. BLANTON. I want just two minutes more.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] can get by with two minutes and I will let my motion stand to close all debate in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Idaho that all debate on this paragraph and on all amendments thereto and on the pending amendments close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, who is our Commander in Chief of the Navy, tells us that there is no necessity for building these three cruisers and asks us not to spend these millions of the public money for them. Does he know what he is talking about? Has he access to all naval experts? Is he informed? Is he loyal? May we rely on him? Is his judgment good? Or, are we to throw him overboard, disregard him, humiliate and embarrass him before the nations of the world, and bow and scrape and kneel to and obey these naval officers who have almost commanded us to appropriate these millions for them to spend? And then when we build them and our next disarmament conference comes—and it will come—we will scrap them and appropriate more millions to pay for the scrapping as we did when we scrapped those fine ships after the last conference. Is that expensive scrapping to be all for naught? Are we to abandon our disarmament program?

I want to read you the names of the valuable warships that we scrapped under our 5-5-3 treaty, and these particular ones were brand new: The *Washington*, the *South Dakota*, the *Indiana*, the *Montana*, the *North Carolina*, the *Iowa*, and the *Massachusetts*. They were brand new, had never been used, and had cost the taxpaying people of the United States millions of dollars each. We also scrapped the *Virginia*, the *Nebraska*, the *Georgia*, the *New Jersey*, the *Rhode Island*, the *Connecticut*, the *Louisiana*, the *Vermont*, the *Kansas*, the *Minnesota*, the *New Hampshire*, the *South Carolina*, and the *Michigan*, which had cost us millions and millions of dollars. We also scrapped the *Lexington*, the *Constitution*, the *Constellation*, the *Saratoga*, and the *Ranger*.

And now, last but not least, we are commanded by naval officers and our jingo leaders here to scrap our disarmament policy and program and our policy of world peace and to build the greatest Navy of the world, which in turn will be outstripped by the competitive building of navies by the countries of the world. I hope we will not do it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in order to have a letter read which explains my position.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter sent to the Clerk's desk.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, December 29, 1926.

NAVAL COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF CONGRESS,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMEN OF THE NAVAL COMMITTEE: I urge you to make the United States Navy the first in the world, and that the building program now before Congress be started at once. This is the sentiment of the State of Pennsylvania, gathered by me on a trip while practicing my profession throughout the State in the past 10 days.

My profession called me from Philadelphia to Warren, the county seat of Warren County, in the center of the oil, gas, and timber section of the northwestern part of the State. Warren County sometimes goes Republican, sometimes Democratic. From there I journeyed to Erie, the county seat of a Republican county, and in the center of the Great Lakes' shipping and commercial area. From there I crossed the State to Danville, in the middle-eastern section, which is the county seat of Montour County, the center of that interior group of counties that have voted Democratic since Jefferson's time. From there to Pottsville, the county seat of Schuylkill County, in the heart of the anthracite coal region, and always Republican. In these places the people thought the same. Whether Republican or Democratic, a great Navy was a patriotic issue solely. There was not a tinge of partisanship. The thought was that the United States should build the strongest Navy in the world. It had tried to substitute reason for force in the conference of 1921 to prevent an armament race, but the other nations disregarded its spirit by going ahead with large building programs. They have shown that force alone commands their respect.

Europe, Asia, old civilization, cynical, treacherous to ideals, thinking only in terms of force. The United States, a young civilization, idealistic, true to its ideals, thinking only in terms of reason. How often is the United States deluded by Europe and Asia? Accepting her ideals with no intention to put them into effect; accepting them solely for personal advantages, and not for the purpose of uplifting the world.

I was a strong friend of the rule of reason until I journeyed to Europe, where I found the Europeans think a person or a nation attempting to rule by reason and not force is weak, is to be despised, and should be utterly ignored.

If you and I are of like mind as to the rule of force, do not threaten to employ force through authorization of an incomparable paper navy. Build it. Then talk. Do not talk, then build. It might be too late then. Japan strikes without warning; quickly. Her wars with Russia

and China reveal this. The person who threatens but can not execute his threats is a bluff.

The United States is the richest and most powerful banker and trustee in the world. The larger the banker the larger the trust fund, the greater the expense and precaution that the banker and the trustee takes for safety. European and Asiatic nations, envious of our wealth, prosperity, and happiness, and thinking that we gained our present position through their misfortune in the last war, will destroy us if we allow wealth to cause us to become soft, lazy, unwilling to spend the energy and time to protect ourselves.

May you vote the necessary appropriations at this Congress for a great building program to make us the world's greatest naval power.

Very truly yours,

JAY W. SECHLER.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I want to offer, and pending the reading of the amendment I simply want to say that I regret very much to differ with the President, because I believe the President is right in what he is trying to do [applause] but wrong in the way he is going about it. The way to get a limitation of armament is to support the Tilson amendment, and by supporting the Tilson amendment we can go into the conference with real cards in our hands. I am opposed any longer to voting for paper ships, paper guns, and paper men to offset the light cruisers of England and Japan. Our bluff has been called and we have nothing but paper armaments to show. I hope that Congress will serve notice upon the nations of the world that hereafter we will provide sufficient funds to build all the light cruisers that are necessary to uphold the 5-5-3 ratio. The amendment I have offered seeks to prevent an unfavorable conclusion among the great naval powers as to the aim of the Congress of the United States in providing funds for three additional light cruisers. The American people believe in the limitation of armaments as a step to world peace. We believe that the only way to remove the fear of competitive armaments and restore confidence and good will among the naval powers is to call another conference for further limitation of naval armaments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH as an amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. TILSON:

"It is the sense of Congress that a conference of the great naval powers be called in the near future by the President of the United States for the consideration of further proportional reduction in naval armaments based on the 5-5-3 ratio and to consider limiting the number of light cruisers and naval aircraft."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order will be reserved. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire recognition for one-half minute?

Mr. LOZIER. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will then recognize the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I believe every man in this House is in favor of an adequate national defense. I furthermore believe every patriotic, red-blooded citizen of our country is likewise in favor of a proper national defense. None of us care anything about pacifists, cowards, or ninnies. It is the duty of Congress to provide for the national defense, and I further believe every Member on this floor will gladly perform that duty.

The question then, is: Have we an adequate national defense? Everybody knows the Navy is the first line; therefore, the question in its finality is: Have we an adequate Navy to defend our country? In 1922, by international treaty, the three great naval powers established a ratio of respective naval strength; that is, the Navies of the United States and Great Britain were to be equal and that of Japan three-fifths the strength of either. This international treaty is known as the limitation of naval armament treaty or conference.

Each of the three great naval powers were at that time engaged in large construction programs of major ships—battleships and battle cruisers. The United States was in the lead. It was building the most powerful fleet of deep-sea ships of any

nation in the world. All nations had just emerged from the Great War and were in competition. It was to save this competition and the enormous amount of money it entailed that this limitation of naval armament conference was called. It was a high and lofty purpose.

All nations were burdened with debt, some fairly overwhelmed. It was in the interest of world rehabilitation and stability of national credits that the movement was founded. Great Britain, while a creditor nation of ours to the amount of nearly \$5,000,000,000, was engaged in building a formidable array of battleships and armored cruisers costing millions of pounds sterling. Japan, while not a creditor nation, was engaged in a like constructive program. The natural thing to do in the face of world conditions was to bring all these nations together in peaceful conference and see if an agreement could not be reached to avoid all this competition and all this expense. The movement was inaugurated by the United States and the treaty was the net result—the 5-5-3 ratio.

The treaty only limited capital ships—battleships, armored cruisers in excess of 10,000 tons mounting guns in excess of 8-inch caliber, and a certain class of auxiliary vessels.

We stopped our construction program immediately and destroyed our vessels then under construction. Other nations did the same but as our construction program was far greater than that of any other nation our loss in that destruction was by far the greatest. We held steadfastly to our covenant with the other nations of the world. So did the other nations as to the class of vessels stated in the treaty. But what did Great Britain do? What did Japan do?

Both these nations switched their construction program from vessels covered in the treaty to vessels not covered in the treaty. Both of them immediately launched great construction programs of cruisers of 10,000 tons mounting 8-inch guns. These nations simply took the amount of money they would have put into battleships and battle cruisers and put it into scout cruisers of 10,000 tons and less. Great Britain and Japan suffered little monetary loss in the vessels they destroyed under the terms of the treaty; we lost far more than both combined. They simply transferred their construction to vessels of another class, no less formidable. These nations or either of them is to-day able to sweep the commerce of America from the seas.

We, in good faith and complying with the spirit of the treaty, stopped construction on practically all kinds and classes of vessels of war. We took our obligation seriously, in good faith, almost in childlike confidence. Not so with Great Britain and Japan.

Of course, accurately speaking they are within the technical construction of the treaty, but both these nations have violated the spirit and the intent of the treaty. Technically they may not build a battleship or a battle cruiser of 30,000 tons, but they may build three scout cruisers each of 10,000 tons to cost an equal amount. This is what they have done and are doing to-day, and we are still trusting in this old-time, childlike simplicity and confidence.

In 1924, late in the year, the American people awoke; Congress awoke. We had observed what others were doing, what Great Britain and Japan were doing, and we passed an act authorizing the construction of eight cruisers of the same class as these two nations had built and were building—more coming every month. Then what did we do? We, still trusting in that same childlike confidence, still slumbered, making no earnest effort to carry out this authorization by commencing construction. Eventually we started on two—one at the New York Navy Yard and the other at Cramps yard in Philadelphia. These are now building, the first 2.7 per cent completed and the latter 1.5 per cent. Then we eventually started on three more; that is, Congress last year made an appropriation to start three more. On this last three the industry was circularized less than two weeks ago, plans and specifications sent out with bids and estimates to be submitted by March 10. Nothing done on the remaining three of the act of December 18, 1924. In the meantime, while we have been comfortably resting in this childlike confidence, what has Great Britain and Japan been doing? It takes between three and four years to build one of these vessels. Great Britain has just an even 40 of this class of vessels now built and in service with 11 more under construction and 3 more appropriated for, making a total of 54 when her present program is completed in 1931. Japan has 19 vessels of this class now built and in commission with 6 more building, making a total of 25 when her program is completed in 1931. We have 10 now built and in commission with 5 more building or we intend to build, making a total of 15. All of these swift scout cruisers, commerce destroyers, if you please, the most formidable and dangerous class of

vessels in the world, for they have 8-inch guns and are of terrific speed with an enormous steaming radius. So that in 1931 the ratio in this type of vessels, the most dangerous that sail the seas, will be 54-25-15. Sad commentary on the 5-5-3 ratio of naval strength!

What this amendment means is that we shall appropriate to start construction of the remaining three provided for in 1924. We all know it will take long enough to build them. Let us in the interest of national defense have at least 18 of this class of vessels as compared with Great Britain 54 and Japan 25. It makes me shudder with the thought of a possible emergency.

I am willing to economize. I am willing, if forced to, to go without the hundreds of things we should have, of conveniences and suitable things for the dispatch of Government business for our own satisfaction, but let us not economize on things absolutely necessary for the national defense, for the public safety. We have economized to the extent of privation, to the extent of going without things that add to the national comfort and convenience. We are enduring privation, but let us not starve ourselves to death. We have trimmed and cut our Nation's expenditures to the bone; we have even taken out some of the bone, but for the sake of that public security let us leave a little of the life blood in the national body.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, probably at no time since I have been a Member of this House has a question been debated into which there has come so much beside the mark and not pertinent to the question at issue. We are not being called upon to decide whether or not there shall be a Navy adequate to the defense of this country. We are not being asked to choose whether or not we shall stand with or against the President of the United States as an abstract question.

If the question should be put to this House as to whether or not an adequate Navy should be maintained, there would not be a dozen votes against the proposition; but it does not, therefore, necessarily follow that there must be consideration here of nothing else, or that the voice of those to whom that is the only issue in this debate should prevail.

The situation is that President Coolidge is not only the Commander in Chief of the Navy, but likewise, and as fully, is charged by the Constitution with those direct duties which have to do with our relations with foreign countries. He stands at the head and is responsible for the Department of State, as well as the Department of the Navy, and in his position as the head he has said that it will advance plans under way for the convening of a conference for the further disarmament of the nations if we do not at this particular time appropriate money for these three cruisers.

The question is, Shall we cooperate in this or shall we not? That is all. It is not a proposal put forth by a pacifist but by the head of a great and powerful Nation sincerely desirous of peace.

President Coolidge has been quoted by both sides in this debate. The only quotation which can properly be used is that which he has given with regard to the exact subject before us, and that is to the effect that it is best for us not to adopt either of these amendments. He has often spoken for a Navy of sufficient size, and it is in nowise inconsistent for him also to say now that it will help toward the good will of the world if we pause a little in the hope that peace will thereby be advanced.

The keen disappointment to me in this debate has been the note of cynicism with regard to the possibility of advancing international understanding and comity by conferences. No doubt there is disappointment that all that was expected of the disarmament conference of 1921 has not materialized. I share that disappointment in so far as it is justified, but I am not willing therefore to sacrifice my faith or to falter in my hope. That idealism which was our greatest heritage from the war must not be wholly lost. We must be on guard and strong on land and sea against every foe, but we must not let depart from out our souls that spark which gleams even in the dark.

The President has not set himself in this matter against the national defense. He says only that good will among the nations will add to that defense also, if it can be further established by this conference, with a consequent halt in impending competitive armaments on the sea, and that we should now give our acquiescence to that end.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] quoted a part of the President's introduction to the book, *World's Chancelleries*, in support of his position in favor of this amendment. A partial quotation may be unintentionally misleading. A full quotation will much more fully set forth what is in the President's mind, and since my judgment goes step by step with it, I give it in full, in support of my opposition to the amendment. It is as follows:

In these carefully wrought statements of sentiment and opinion we have, I conceive, a peculiarly suggestive and important achievement in the field of international conciliation.

Humanity, with reference to the danger of war, is to-day in a position different from that which it occupied yesterday. Wars once sprang from varied causes—biological, racial, dynastic, political, commercial, personal. Wars were sought. Wars were planned. Wars were a part of the accepted rationale of organized human life.

Those days, we venture to think, are past. But, if they are, it does not follow that the danger of war is past. War may be, and doubtless is, less probable than it was. Its real nature, its horror, and unmitigated calamity are more poignantly and widely realized than they were. Yet so imperfectly do races and nations understand one another, so perplexing are many of their multiplying relationships, so restless are certain forces of evil, so insecure are the psychological bases of peace, that humanity truly may be said to live constantly in the shadow of the possibility of war.

Not in war deliberate, but in war accidental, seems to me to lie the principal present peril. We have a world psychology more inflammable, more explosive, than it ought to be. There is tinder about. There are powder mines. Any flying spark is dangerous. Our war with Spain, as we all remember, was precipitated by the sinking of the *Maine*; and the Great War, whatever may have been its antecedents of history and of rivalry, rushed upon the world out of the Serajevo assassinations. We need fortification against accidents. We need an international mind more stably balanced against sudden shocks.

It is the distinctive virtue of these discussions, in my view, that they tend to give us such an international mind. One feels their earnestness, their sympathetic quality, their sincerity. One is moved by their eloquence. Almost every major principle and problem of civilized life fall within their range, and their outlook consistently is that of the common interests of mankind. If racial susceptibilities and nationalistic standpoints are urged with vividness and candor, they thus are urged, as I read them, only in the hope that the world, by gaining fuller knowledge of its parts, may be less ignorant of itself as a whole.

Before we have the fact we must have the philosophy of world peace. All the men here interviewed endeavor to elucidate this philosophy. Their points of view should be of immense educational value. Their cordiality should make for a friendlier interracial and international mood. If cynicism be heard in this connection, I would say that in a meeting of amicable sentiment and well-disposed reasoning there is measureless power for good. Such meetings—such streams of moral and intellectual energy—irrigate the generous hopes and purposes of men. And such streams grow as they flow. They grow as they flow, for in their long course toward their mighty objective corresponding tributaries never cease to join them.

World peace, a world affair, stands or falls by world opinion. If we are to have world peace; in other words, we must have the necessary world opinion to support it. And if we are to have this opinion we must have the right feeling underneath it. Such feeling, in turn, can exist only if races and nations be convinced that aggression and exploitation have had their day, that brute force is to be brought under mental and ethical control, that all-around justice is the fixed purpose—that civilization, in short, is to establish itself conclusively over barbarism. Feeling issues in thought, thought in action. What, therefore, could be more desirable than public expressions calculated to make international feeling what it ought to be, in order that international action may be what it ought to be?

Enlightened minds and sympathetic hearts are the hope of the world. Without them, statesmanship can do nothing; with them, it faces no insoluble problem. Public opinion rooted in right feeling has countless victories to its credit. Its triumphs increase through the generations; if they did not, men of all colors and creeds would be on the back track. Public opinion abolished human slavery. It is waging a winning fight in a thousand directions. It is widening the scope and cementing the foundations of humanism in industry and liberty in politics. Give it light. Give it the light of the spirit and the light of the mind. Do this and we shall march without halting to the permanent relegation of war.

America, I need not say, is fervently for peace. This fact stands out boldly in her history. It is written in her treaties, in her diplomacy, and in every utterance that reflects the emotions and convictions of her people. Who can misunderstand the moral, the lesson, the evidence of the Washington conference? Could any war-coveting nation in America's highly privileged position have called or responded to that conference or made the self-denying proposals America made and others accepted there? Certainly we, if anyone, were able to follow the old militaristic lines, but we elected to strike an historic blow for peace. Our feelings and purposes are unchanged. We are still against swollen armaments. Our attitude of mind is still that of the Washington conference. And hence it is that we welcome, and warmly welcome, every exhibition of peaceful purpose, whether it shows itself in the region of theory or in the region of practice.

Mr. Chairman, I was one who last session voted to authorize these ships and who has always felt that our armies and our fleets must be strong, and fully strong, for the national defense, but the time must never come when I shall not be likewise willing to support measures for our national defense through mutual and friendly understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will now hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] on the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment to the substitute that it is in no sense whatever germane. It is not germane to either the amendment or the substitute to the amendment now pending before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is clear upon the point of order. The amendment is not germane to the substitute and, in the opinion of the Chair, it is legislation. The point of order is sustained. The question is upon the substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. RANKIN. May the substitute be again reported?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, may we have both the amendment and the substitute again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment and the substitute to the amendment will again be reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Black of New York amendment and the Tilson substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. FRENCH and Mr. BLANTON)—ayes 122, noes 117.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TILSON and Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Is the pending question, Shall the Tilson amendment be substituted for the amendment originally offered by myself?

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitution of the Tilson amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 137.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK of New York)—ayes 20, noes 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 8, insert the following: "And toward the construction of three fleet submarines heretofore authorized, to have the highest practicable speed and greatest desirable radius of action and to cost not to exceed \$5,300,000 each for construction and machinery and \$850,000 each for armor, armament, and ammunition, \$4,500,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is not authorized by law.

Mr. FRENCH. It is authorized by law.

Mr. BLACK of New York. It is authorized by the 1916 act.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order, as we can expedite time by voting down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate is closed on the paragraph and all amendments thereto. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, completing the reading of the bill, read as follows:

No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Gov-

ernment plant; and that no part of the moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or herein made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 53, line 2, after the word "plant," as to the residue of that paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Virginia discusses his point of order I make the additional point of order against the entire paragraph, because it contains legislation unauthorized by law on an appropriation bill. If the Chair will look at the latter part he will see that it interferes with the discretion that is given an officer and would require him to make investigations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A point of order, Mr. Chairman; I have the floor. I am willing that the gentleman from Texas may make his point of order, but not to make a speech when I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. I was simply stating my point of order and not making a speech, as the rules require my point of order to be stated before there is any debate on it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Chair once ruled on almost this precise question, and the identical question was ruled upon last year by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH]. Therefore, I do not care to take up the time of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order against the entire paragraph. This language has frequently been passed upon by Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole. The first part of the paragraph is the nonstop-watch provision which has been held in order by numerous chairmen and upon which decisions to the contrary have been overruled by the Committee of the Whole. While the present occupant of the chair has frequently argued on the floor that the stop-watch provision was not in order, he feels it incumbent to follow the precedents thus established, and holds that portion of the paragraph is not out of order. The Chair believes the second portion prohibiting any part of the appropriation in the act to be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash awards to any employee in addition to his regular wages is out of order, as in the opinion of the Chair it is not merely a denial of the appropriation but includes substantive legislation requiring action on the part of Government officers who are to enforce that portion of the paragraph. With reference to the last part of the paragraph, mentioned by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] the precedents are conclusive that that portion of the paragraph is out of order, and the Chair without citing any further authority refers to the decision of Chairman LEHLBACH, a very comprehensive and clear decision on this point rendered January 25, 1926, on the naval appropriation bill. A portion of the paragraph being out of order it is the duty of the Chair, upon an objection to the entire paragraph, to hold that the whole paragraph is out of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, after line 13, add as a new paragraph the following:

"No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. It contains legislation which the Chair has held to be out of order on an appropriation bill and because it interferes with the discretion of an executive.

Further, the amendment is not germane to any part of the bill. The Chair will see that it is not germane to the preceding paragraph of the bill to which it is offered. There is a distinction made between language put in the bill by the committee and the language offered from the floor as an amend-

ment. If it is put in by the committee, it makes it germane by putting it in but where the bill comes to us without any part of this provision an amendment offered from the floor, which amendment is not germane to any part of the bill, is under a very different rule, and especially because this has been held out of order several times by Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order as to the question of germaneness. The Chair thinks the amendment is germane because it is intended as a limitation or a provision affecting all of the appropriations in the act. Therefore, that portion of the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is overruled. The Chair sustains the point of order as to last part of the amendment.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DALLINGER: On page 52, after line 13, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to state that this provision has been in all of the appropriation bills, and as the chairman has said, has been repeatedly held to be in order. For the benefit of those who do not know about the stop watch, I would say that the stop watch was an abuse which was in the arsenals and navy yards for a time. It was prohibited by Congress, and everything is getting along all right in the arsenals and navy yards at the present time. There is not a single Member of this House who would want to have some one watch him with a stop watch all of the day, and I do not believe we should force it upon the employees of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is a provision to prevent any efficiency in navy yards. That is all I want to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DALLINGER) there were—ayes 118, noes 56.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House, together with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDBLOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15641—the naval appropriation bill—and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote upon the amendment at the foot of page 42, providing for the dirigible.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 1, after the semicolon insert: "Toward the construction of one of the rigid airships authorized in public act No. 422, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved June 24, 1926, \$200,000, not to cost exceeding \$4,500,000, and *Provided*, That in any contract made for the construction of such airships the Government is to be allowed credit for any savings resulting from the installation of substitute gas cells for goldbeaters' skin."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON of Georgia) there were—ayes 185, noes 105.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twelve Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that it report the same back forthwith with the so-called Tilson amendment, which motion to recommit I send to the desk, and on the motion to recommit I move the previous question.

Mr. BERGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill with instructions to—

The SPEAKER. But the Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Illinois opposed to the bill?

Mr. BRITTEN. I am.

Mr. BERGER. So am I.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRITTEN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 51, line 8, under the heading "Increase of the Navy" strike out the figures "\$3,750,000" and substitute therefor the following: "\$14,200,000, of which sum \$450,000 shall be immediately available towards the construction of the last three of the eight scout cruisers authorized by section 2 of the act approved December 18, 1924."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Illinois on which he demands the yeas and nays. Evidently a sufficient number and the yeas and nays are ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 161, nays 183, answered "present" 1, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—161

Andrew	Drane	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connell, N. Y.
Appleby	Drewry	Johnson, Wash.	O'Connell, R. I.
Aswell	Eaton	Kahn	O'Connor, Ia.
Auf der Heide	Edwards	Kelly	Oliver, N. Y.
Bacharach	Englebright	Kemp	Parker
Bachmann	Fairchild	Ketcham	Parks
Bacon	Faust	Kless	Patterson
Bankhead	Fish	Kincheloe	Porter
Black, N. Y.	Fisher	Kurtz	Pou
Bland	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Lanham	Quayle
Bloom	Freeman	Lankford	Ransley
Brand, Ga.	Frothingham	Lazaro	Rayburn
Briggs	Gambrell	Lea, Calif.	Reece
Britten	Garrett, Tenn.	Leatherwood	Robison, Ky.
Buchanan	Garrett, Tex.	Lindsay	Rogers
Butler	Gasque	Linthicum	Rowbottom
Byrns	Gilbert	Lyon	Sanders, N. Y.
Campbell	Glynn	McDuffie	Sanders, Tex.
Carpenter	Gorman	McFadden	Sandlin
Chapman	Green, Fla.	McMillan	Sears, Fla.
Chindblom	Hadley	McKeynolds	Smithwick
Cochran	Hale	Magee, N. Y.	Snell
Collier	Harrison	Magee, Ia.	Somers, N. Y.
Connally, Tex.	Hawley	Magrady	Spearing
Connelly	Hayden	Major	Stedman
Corning	Hill, Ala.	Mansfield	Strother
Coyle	Hill, Md.	Mead	Swing
Crisp	Hooper	Menges	Temple
Cullen	Houston	Merritt	Tilson
Darrow	Hudspeth	Miller	Tinkham
Davenport	Hull, Tenn.	Milligan	Tydings
Davey	James	Mills	Underwood
Davis	Jeffers	Montague	Udike
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Ill.	Morgan	Upshaw
Douglass	Johnson, Ind.	Newton, Minn.	Valle
Doyle	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norton	Vinson, Ga.

Vinson, Ky.
Wainwright
Warren
Watres
Watson

Weaver
Weller
Welch, Calif.
Wilson, La.
Wingo

Winter
Woodrum
Woodyard
Wright
Wurzbach

Wyant
Zihlman

NAYS—183

Abernethy
Ackerman
Adkins
Allen
Allgood
Almon
Arnold
Ayres
Bailey
Barbour
Beedy
Beers
Borger
Black, Tex.
Blanton
Boles
Bowles
Bowman
Box
Brand, Ohio
Brigham
Browne
Burtness
Burton
Busby
Cannon
Carss
Carter, Okla.
Chalmers
Clague
Cole
Collins
Colton
Cooper, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.
Cramton
Cresser
Crowther
Hallinger
Denison
Dickinson, Iowa
Dominick
Doughton
Dowell
Driver
Elliott

Elliis
Eslick
Fitzgerald, W. T.
Fletcher
Fort
Foss
Frear
French
Fulmer
Funk
Furlow
Gardner, Ind.
Garner, Tex.
Gibson
Gifford
Goodwin
Green, Iowa
Greenwood
Griest
Hall, Ind.
Hall, N. Dak.
Hardy
Hare
Hastings
Haugen
Hersey
Hoch
Hogg
Holaday
Howard
Huddleston
Hudson
Hull, Morton D.
Hull, William E.
Irwin
Jacobstein
Jones
Kearns
Keller
Kleffner
King
Kirk
Knutson
Kopp
Kunz
Kvale

LaGuardia
Lampert
Larsen
Leavitt
Little
Lowrey
Lozier
Luce
McClintic
McKeown
McLaughlin, Nebr.
MacGregor
Manlove
Mapes
Martin, Mass.
Michener
Moore, Ky.
Moore, Ohio
Morehead
Morrow
Murphy
Nelson, Me.
Nelson, Mo.
Nelson, Wis.
Oliver, Ala.
Peavey
Perkins
Pratt
Quin
Rason
Rahney
Ramseyer
Rankin
Rathbone
Reed, N. Y.
Robinson, Iowa
Romjue
Rouse
Rube
Rutherford
Sabath
Schafer
Schneider
Scott
Sears, Nebr.

Seger
Shallenberger
Shreve
Simmons
Sinclair
Sinnott
Sosnowski
Speaks
Sproul, Ill.
Sproul, Kans.
Stalker
Stegall
Stobbs
Summers, Wash.
Summers, Tex.
Swank
Sweet
Taber
Taylor, Colo.
Taylor, Tenn.
Thatcher
Thomas
Thompson
Thurston
Tillman
Timberlake
Tinchin
Treadway
Tucker
Underhill
Vincent, Mich.
Voigt
Wason
Wefald
Wheeler
White, Kans.
White, Me.
Whitehead
Whittington
Williams, Ill.
Williams, Tex.
Williamson
Wilson, Miss.
Wolverton
Wood

Mr. Kendall with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Free with Mr. Peery.
Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Arentz with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Prall.
Mr. Browning with Mr. Reed of Arkansas.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Goldsborough.
Mr. Swartz with Mr. McSweeney.
Mr. Vestal with Mr. Carter of Oklahoma.
Mr. Golder with Mr. Taylor of West Virginia.
Mr. Hickey with Mr. Cleary.
Mr. Taylor of New Jersey with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
Mr. Esterly with Mr. Beck.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. STRONG, is recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. COX. I was not in the Hall and can not vote, but I would like to be recorded as "present."

Mr. BRUMM. Am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. BRUMM. No; I was walking out in the lobby.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule. To qualify the gentleman must be in the Hall listening.

Mr. BRUMM. I wish to be recorded as "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CORRECTION OF TOTALS

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, before the final vote is had on the bill I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be instructed to correct totals as may be affected by amendments to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the vote by which this amendment was defeated be reconsidered and that motion lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. FRENCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PREPARATORY COMMISSION FOR A DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

In a message which I submitted to you on January 4, 1926, I recommended the appropriation of the sum of \$50,000 to cover the expenses of American participation in the work of the "Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference, being a commission to prepare for a conference on the reduction and limitation of armaments." By House Joint Resolution 107, approved February 1, 1926, you authorized the appropriation of this amount.

The preparatory commission met at Geneva on May 18, 1926. Its work has continued, through plenary sessions and subcommittee meetings, since that date. The task of the commission's subcommittees, to which was delegated the detailed study of many of the problems presented to it, has virtually been completed, and it is planned to hold another plenary meeting of the commission, probably in March, to consider the subcommittee reports. Although it is difficult to predict the exact duration of the forthcoming sessions, it can reasonably be assumed that they will continue over a period of some months. It is the avowed purpose of the preparatory commission at the forthcoming meetings to evolve a definite agenda for a conference for the reduction and limitation of armament, which is, of course, the end to which the deliberations of the preparatory commission are directed.

I believe that the preliminary work has been useful and that there is good reason to hope for concrete results from further meetings. Our representatives have consistently endeavored to play a helpful part, and to direct the attention of the commission to the possibility of practical accomplishment.

I believe that we should continue to give our full cooperation to the work of the preparatory commission, with a view to bringing about, as quickly as possible, a final conference, at which further steps may be taken to reduce and limit armaments.

The policy of this Government to favor measures which hold out practical hopes for the limitation of armament is firmly established. By continuing our hearty cooperation in the preparatory work, we shall be able to do our share in formulating an agenda for the final conference which will give promise of actual agreements for arms limitation.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NOT VOTING—88

Aldrich
Andresen
Anthony
Arentz
Barkley
Beck
Begg
Bell
Bixler
Bowling
Boylan
Browning
Brumm
Bulwinkle
Burdick
Canfield
Carew
Carter, Calif.
Celler
Christopherson
Cleary
Connolly, Pa.

Crumpacker
Curry
Deal
Dempsey
Dickstein
Dyer
Estorly
Evans
Fenn
Fredericks
Free
Gallivan
Garber
Golder
Goldsborough
Graham
Griffin
Hammer
Hickey
Hill, Wash.
Jenkins
Johnson, Ky.

Kendall
Kerr
Kindred
Lee, Ga.
Lehlbach
Letts
Lineberger
McLaughlin, Mich.
McLeod
McSwain
McSweeney
Madden
Martin, La.
Michaelson
Montgomery
Mooney
Morin
Newton, Mo.
O'Connor, N. Y.
Oldfield
Peery
Perlman

Phillips
Prall
Purnell
Reed, Ark.
Reid, Ill.
Smith
Stephens
Stevenson
Strong, Kans.
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Swartz
Swoope
Taylor, N. J.
Taylor, W. Va.
Tolley
Vare
Vestal
Walters
Welsh, Pa.
Woodruff
Yates

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

To recommit:

Mr. Burdick (for) with Mr. Anthony (against).
Mr. Curry (for) with Mr. Madden (against).
Mr. Aldrich (for) with Mr. Letts (against).
Mr. Kindred (for) with Mr. Vare (against).
Mr. Deal (for) with Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania (against).
Mr. Fenn (for) with Mr. Strong of Kansas (against).
Mr. Gallivan (for) with Mr. Michaelson (against).
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).

Mr. Yates (for) with Mr. Canfield (against).

General pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Begg with Mr. Barkley.
Mr. Dyer with Mr. Mooney.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Carew.
Mr. Lehlbach with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Hammer.
Mr. Smith with Mr. McSwain.
Mr. McLaughlin of Michigan with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Purnell with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Oldfield.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Evans.
Mr. Garber with Mr. Hill of Washington.
Mr. Crumpacker with Mr. Boylan.
Mr. McLeod with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Andresen with Mr. Bowling.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Phillips with Mr. Martin of Louisiana.
Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Griffin.

The appropriation of \$50,000 already made for this work has been exhausted. I therefore recommend that there be authorized further appropriation of \$75,000 to cover the expenses of American participation in the forthcoming activities of the preparatory commission. I recommend this sum because, when the commission undertakes the actual drafting of an agenda, it may be necessary to send a considerable number of American representatives to insure adequate representation in all phases of the work. Since the exact requirements can not be foreseen and will depend on developments, it appears wise to provide a sufficient appropriation to meet contingencies that may arise.

In relation to the form of the appropriation, the prices prevailing at Geneva and the nature of the responsibility devolving upon the members of the delegation make it important that their expenditures for subsistence be exempted from the restrictions imposed by existing law and be made discretionary with the Secretary of State.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

Washington, January 7, 1927.

The SPEAKER. The message and accompanying papers are ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

THE LATE HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I present an order to set apart a day for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. ROBERT MARION LA FOLLETTE, late a Senator from the State of Wisconsin, and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin presents an order and asks for its present consideration. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Sunday, the 20th day of February, at 11 o'clock, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. ROBERT MARION LA FOLLETTE, late a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the order was agreed to.

FLORIDA'S GOVERNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short editorial on the government of the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. On what subject is it?

Mr. GREEN of Florida. It is a short editorial on the State government of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print in the RECORD granted me on yesterday, I am going to include the editorial taken from the Nashville Banner; said editorial brings out very forcefully the splendid State government of my great State of Florida, and is as follows:

Florida is one State that is pointing the way to economy in its administration. A bulletin sent from the Florida State Chamber of Commerce contains the statement that substantial taxpayers throughout the country, alarmed at the extravagance of their State governments, the growing number of commissions, boards, and bureaus, and the activities of public officials busily exploring every avenue in search of new sources of revenue to support top-heavy pay rolls, are studying the government and taxation policies of the State of Florida with increasing interest.

Florida, the bulletin states, always has regarded government as a business and not a political proposition, predicated upon the idea that Florida, the State, is operated for the benefit of all its people and not for the glorification of politicians. In 1925, for example, the State comptroller collected \$11,000,000 in automobile license and gasoline taxes at a cost of only \$8,000, a record probably unequaled in the annals of the country. The State highway department, with a staff of only 17 employees, 6 of whom are divisional engineers scattered over as many parts of the State, expended \$15,000,000 of State funds in highway construction during 1926 and in addition supervised the expenditure of approximately \$10,000,000 by the various counties upon county projects.

Florida possesses a number of commissions and boards, but the governor and the six members of his cabinet—the State department heads—compose nearly all of them. The governor and the cabinet, sitting about a table, may spend several hours in session as the internal improvement board, shaping policies in connection with reclamation projects in the Everglades. Without leaving their seats another secretary is summoned and the cabinet resolves itself into another board or

commission, accomplishing in one hour, without previous preparation, that which would require several days and heavy expense were the board composed of persons in distant parts of the State who would have to be summoned to transact business.

Those boards or commissions organized outside of the cabinet are composed of leading business men in the State who serve at nominal salaries, if any, and who render expense accounts incident to attending any session that may be held. The board of control, as an example, which compiles the budgets for the State's institutions of higher learning and supervises the expenditure of funds, is composed of a group of citizens among whose membership are several bankers. The State highway department is centered in a board of five men, one representative citizen from each of the four congressional districts and one at large who serves as chairman and chief executive of the department.

A census of State employees at Tallahassee, the capital, reveals that the State, despite its gigantic business centered at that point, maintains only 345 persons there and they include everyone from the governor and the members of the supreme court down to office boys and charwomen. There is no deadwood at Tallahassee nor at any other point where persons are maintained on the State's pay roll.

The State prison costs nothing, for it not only is self-supporting but is turning a surplus over to the treasury. The reform school for boys, the corrective school for girls, the school for the feeble-minded and the State hospital for the insane all contribute materially to their upkeep with revenue derived from their farms and industries.

Florida's government has been and is being operated so economically it has been found unnecessary to impose those taxes which are so common and such a burden to the people of other States. It has no severance tax, no corporation tax, no corporation stock transfer tax, no franchise tax, no income tax, or no inheritance tax. The State does not owe so much as one penny and the surplus in its treasury has not fallen below \$10,000,000 in so many months the treasurer would be forced to search his records to determine when it was.

Without a multiplicity of bureaus, boards, and commissions, and an army of State employees maintained only for the purpose of keeping pickets nailed on political fences, Florida has learned that economy in government is feasible. Its highways are being built with funds derived from the automobile license and gasoline taxes. All its other revenue is derived solely from an occupation tax and an ad valorem tax on personal property, and even the property tax was reduced 30 per cent in 1926, while other States were increasing their levies and searching for and adopting new sources of revenue.

It is well enough for members of the incoming legislature to contrast Florida methods of government with the tremendous cost, the deadwood in office, the slipshod methods, and the enormous taxation in Tennessee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 15008, entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. McNARY, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. KENDRICK.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KINDRED, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS TO-MORROW AND ON MONDAY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, next Monday being the second Monday in the month, it will be in order then to consider District bills. I hope on next Monday that the independent offices appropriation bill will be under consideration, so that District business should not be taken up on that day. There are a number of bills on the District calendar reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia to which there is no opposition; that is, there are no minority views or statements thereon. I therefore ask that on to-morrow it shall be in order to consider bills on the District of Columbia calendar that have been reported without minority views.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should have an understanding as to just what bills are involved, because there are some bills that have come from that committee without minority expression which have great opposition in the House, and in having this matter advanced and brought up at a time when it is not expected to come up we should understand definitely that only bills should be considered that have not opposition in the House as well as in committee.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. What bills does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Maryland will state what bills he plans to bring up, I will know if I have any objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I think the gentleman has in mind the bill concerning the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government. It is not the intention to bring up that bill. He may also have in mind the Columbia Hospital bill. It is not the intention to bring that up. They are simply bills about which there is no controversy in the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are not bills involving any considerable expenditure of money or placing burdens on the Federal Treasury?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman knows that the power to appropriate is not lodged in our committee. It is lodged in the committee of which the gentleman himself is a member. We have no appropriating power. There are several bills that carry authorizations but no appropriations.

Mr. CRAMTON. In view of the statement that the gentleman from Maryland has made, I will say he is an awfully good guesser, and I shall make no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not want either the majority leader or the chairman of the District Committee or the membership of the House to understand that there will not be opposition to some of those bills. It is impossible to file minority views against all the bills that come from that committee. I am sure no colleague here will accuse me of being inactive. I tried to read the majority reports, but I can not read them all. There will be some opposition to some of these bills on the floor, but there will be no objection to the gentleman's request.

Mr. TILSON. It was my purpose to make it clear that only the bills that have been reported without opposition in the committee will be called up.

Mr. BLANTON. There have been few meetings of the committee within the last week or two, and some bills may have been reported out without meetings of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] asks unanimous consent that on to-morrow it will be in order to consider bills from the District of Columbia Committee without minority views. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 8, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, January 8, 1927, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To create a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing and in the control and disposition of the surplus of agricultural commodities by means of the establishment of Federal agricultural export corporations for the basic agricultural commodities (H. R. 15655).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To hear General Summerall on the Army appropriation bill.

FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 10

COMMITTEE ON CENSUS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider reapportionment of Members of the House of Representatives among the several States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

850. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation under the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1927, in the sum of \$20,000 (H. Doc. No. 630), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WINTER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 5991. A bill authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Black Hills and Harney Forests, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 15016. A bill to authorize the purchase of a post-office site at Tamaqua, Pa., subject to mineral reservations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 15547. A bill to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 15668. A bill authorizing the acquisition of a site for the farmers' produce market, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 15825. A bill to authorize the designation of deputy fiscal or disbursing agents in the Department of Agriculture stationed outside of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 1696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. S. 4663. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire certain lands within the District of Columbia to be used as sites for public buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 14925. A bill authorizing the sale of the new subtreasury building and site in San Francisco, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McFADDEN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 756. An act directing the Secretary of the Treasury to complete purchases of silver under the act of April 23, 1918, commonly known as the Pittman Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9666. A bill to correct the military record of Owen J. Owen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10953. A bill for the relief of William Perkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 12783. A bill to provide for the payment of the amount of an adjusted-service certificate to Irving D'Forrest Parks, beneficiary designated by Corp. Steve McNeil Parks, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12889. A bill to relinquish the title of the United States to the land in the claim of Moses Steadham, situate in the county of Baldwin, State of Alabama; without amendment (Rept. No. 1701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 352. A resolution directing the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the House certain information; adverse (Rept. No. 1691). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 16017) granting public lands to the city of Golden, Colo., to secure a supply of water

for municipal and domestic purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 16018) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, and to widows and former widows of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 16019) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 16020) granting relief to veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 16021) to authorize the incorporated town of Seward, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000, for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Seward, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 16022) to increase the salaries of the assistant to the Attorney General and the Assistant Attorneys General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 16023) relating to the transfusion of blood by members of the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 16024) to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Yell and Pope County bridge district, Dardanelle and Russellville, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near the city of Dardanelle, Yell County, Ark.," approved March 3, 1925, and to extend the time for the construction of the bridge authorized thereby; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 365) providing an assistant clerk at the Speaker's table; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SOSNOWSKI: Resolution (H. Res. 366) calling on the Secretary of the Treasury for information concerning real estate and farm lands as bases of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 16025) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Bandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 16026) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Oliver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16027) authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine questions of law involved in the alleged erroneous collection of tonnage taxes in 1920 and 1921 on three vessels operated by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, under bare-boat charter from a Danzig corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 16028) granting a pension to Leanna L. Dillon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLASS: A bill (H. R. 16029) for the relief of Pietro Bruno; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16030) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Henry Whall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 16031) granting a pension to Lester A. Rockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16032) for the relief of Hugh Flaherty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN: A bill (H. R. 16033) granting an increase of pension to Cora F. Marlette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16034) granting an increase of pension to Nancy A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 16035) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16036) for the relief of Charles C. Rehtz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 16037) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Bachor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16038) granting a pension to Malissa Steed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16039) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Wild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 16040) granting an increase of pension to Augusta M. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16041) for the relief of the First National Bank, Savanna, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16042) granting an increase of pension to Lacey Ladd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUNZ: A bill (H. R. 16043) to correct the naval record of James Allen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 16044) granting an increase of pension to Susan Nevitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 16045) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Sturgis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 16046) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 16047) granting a pension to Belle Frink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 16048) granting an increase of pension to Jacob K. Goldsmith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 16049) granting an increase of pension to Harvey C. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 16050) granting a pension to F. M. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16051) granting a pension to Lydia A. Whitehead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 16052) for the relief of the United Chemical & Industrial Cos.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16053) for the relief of the Crimora Mangane Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16054) granting an increase of pension to Hannah L. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 16055) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16056) granting an increase of pension to William A. Pfaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16057) granting an increase of pension to Annie R. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 16058) for the relief of certain officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 16059) granting an increase of pension to Sylvia C. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 16060) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Brake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16061), granting a pension to Lydia Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 16062) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Rockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16063) granting an increase of pension to Jennie A. Seely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 16064) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16065) granting a pension to Sara R. Brewster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 16066) granting a pension to Rachel B. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16067) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and civilian employees of the Navy Department to accept certain medals tendered them by the Republic of China, and to authorize Capt. Walter S. Crosley, United States Navy, to accept medal of honor and merit diploma from the Republic of Haiti; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 16068) granting an increase of pension to Olive Surrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16069) granting an increase of pension to Mary Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 16070) for the relief of Sunny Brook Distillery Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATRES: A bill (H. R. 16071) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: A bill (H. R. 16072) granting an increase of pension to Chathrine J. McGregor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4487. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of George Loisselle and other citizens of Swanton, Vt., favoring the passage of pension legislation for the relief of veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4488. By Mr. BURTON: Resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, December 31, 1926, approving the establishment of a national post road and military highway from a point on or near the Atlantic coast to a point on or near the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4489. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition on the persecution of Jews in Rumania adopted by the Jewish Federation of St. Louis, Tuesday, January 4, 1927, submitted by the officers—Julius Glaser, president; Ferdinand S. Back, director; and Bernard Greenfelder; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4490. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Rasmus Larsen and five other residents of Lapeer County, Mich., protesting against the passage of any legislation increasing the quota of the southern countries of Europe; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4491. By Mr. DRIVER: Petition signed by citizens of Mississippi, Craighead, and Woodruff Counties, Ark., urging immediate action and support of the Civil War pension bill granting relief to needy and suffering veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4492. By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: Resolution adopted by the mayor and city council of the city of Brockton, Mass., urging the immediate passage of radio legislation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4493. Also, petition of employees of the Pneumatic Scale Corporation (Ltd.), of Norfolk Downs, Mass., favoring the immediate passage of radio legislation; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4494. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Mr. Julius Daniels, 4 Harlem Street, Dorchester, Mass., urging prompt enactment of proper legislation to clear up the situation regarding radio broadcasting; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

4495. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition signed by Mrs. Mary L. Garner, 721 North Hill Street, South Bend, Ind., and numerous other citizens of South Bend, advocating more liberal pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4496. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of the citizens of Royal Oak, Mich., opposing the passage of House bill 10311, or any other bill enforcing the observance of the Sabbath; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4497. By Mr. JACOBSTEIN: Petition signed by 101 citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging relief for Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4498. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 13450, granting increase of pension to widows of Civil War soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4499. By Mr. LEA of California: Petitions of 64 residents of Sonoma County, Calif., and 12 residents of Lake County, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bills (H. R. 7179 and 7822); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4500. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of Mr. Wm. T. Phillips and 36 other citizens of Vernon County, Mo., urging the passage of legislation affecting Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4501. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of American Steamship Owners' Association, favoring adequate appropriations for mail-transportation contracts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4502. Also, petition of the Wisconsin Agriculturist, favoring reduction of second-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4503. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of various organizations, Detroit, Mich., urging the repeal of the national origin clause of the 1924 immigration bill, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4504. By Mr. MORROW: Petition in favor of House bill 13450, granting pensions and increase of pensions to widows and former widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4505. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution passed at annual convention of Minnesota Cannery Association, urging passage of appropriation of \$10,000,000 for fight and control of European corn borer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4506. Also, petition of sundry residents of Minneapolis, urging further Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4507. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Spirit of '76 Council, No. 37, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the Wadsworth amendment to House bill 6238; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4508. Also, petition of the American Steamship Owners' Association, of New York City, favoring the Senate amendment restoring the necessary appropriation to pay for the carriage of mails during the fiscal year 1928, in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4509. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of citizens of Lorimer, Iowa, and vicinity, requesting that the alien deportation bill be passed and no modification of the immigration law be passed; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4510. Also, petition of citizens of Garden Grove, Iowa, and vicinity, requesting steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill in order; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

4511. Also, petition of citizens of Osceola, Iowa, against House bill 10311; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4512. By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution of the council of administration, Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that a request be made of Congress that the adjusted service certificate be matured immediately; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4513. By Mr. WATSON: Petition presented by John Ruttle, containing 2,000 names, voters of the ninth congressional district of Pennsylvania, for enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, and in opposition to the increase of alcoholic contents in beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, January 8, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, the author and giver of life, we turn our thoughts toward Thee this morning recognizing Thy blessings, not that we deserve them but out of Thy mercy Thou dost regard us and help us. Be pleased to be very near to each one, and may every duty be performed in Thy fear and for Thy glory, and so guide our ways. We ask in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 15641) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113) authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a pedestal for the Albert Gallatin statue in Washington, D. C., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

RETIREMENT OF EMERGENCY OFFICERS

Mr. TYSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 486, Senate bill 3027, known as the emergency officers' retirement bill, be made a special order of business of the Senate immediately after the conclusion of the discussion on and disposition of the House bill 7553, known as the maternity and infancy bill, which bill is now the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. KING. I object.